DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 939 PS 024 526

AUTHOR Ooms, Theodora; And Others
TITLE Disconnected Dads: Strategies for Promoting Responsible Fatherhood. Family Impact Seminar (Washington, DC, June 23, 1995). Background Briefing Report and Seminar Highlights.
INSTITUTION Family Impact Seminar (FIS), The AAMFT Research and Education Foundation, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 76p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Child Support; Family Financial Resources; Family Life Education; Family Structure; *Fathers; Financial Support; *Government Role; Legal Responsibility; Parent Associations; *Parent Child Relationship; Parent Education; *Parent Participation; *Parent Responsibility; *Parent Role; Policy Formation; Sex Education; Social Environment

ABSTRACT

Noting that a growing number of men are not fulfilling their financial, moral, or social responsibilities to their children, this report aims to provide a rough "map" of the main elements of an emerging fatherhood movement along with a discussion of related policy and program initiatives. The report also provides selected examples of innovative programs and initiatives to illustrate strategies that federal and state policymakers can employ to encourage responsible fatherhood. Organized according to the three main dimensions of paternal responsibility--avoiding out-of-wedlock births, providing financial support, and building caring relationships with their children--the reports contains the following sections: Part I, "The Fatherhood Movement," which includes the background of its establishment and discussions of fathers' rights groups, programs for fathers in "fragile" families, public information and education campaigns about fatherhood, and paternal involvement in family service programs; Part II, "Prevention of Teen and Out-of-Wedlock Births," which includes discussions on sex and family life education and male involvement in family planning; Part III, "Responsibility To Provide Economic Support," which includes a discussion of child support issues and the roles of policymakers as well as the government in improving child support; Part IV, "Connecting Fathers with Their Children," which includes a discussion of the roles and importance of fathers and strategies for developing healthier father-child relationships; Part V, "Summary and Conclusions," which includes a discussion of the key issues addressed in the report; Part VI, "Resources and References," which includes listings of electronic resources, video resources, names of fatherhood organizations, and bibliographic references; and Part VII, "Highlights of the Seminar," which includes summaries of seminar speakers' comments. The report concludes with a table of strategies to promote responsible fatherhood. Contains 108 references. (MOK)

ED 400 939

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Disconnected Dads: Strategies for Promoting Responsible Fatherhood

Background Briefing Report and Seminar Highlights

PS 024526

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Bonnie Wahiba
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Family Impact Seminar

An Independent, Nonpartisan Public Policy Institute

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Disconnected Dads: Strategies for Promoting Responsible Fatherhood

Background Briefing Report

by Theodora Ooms, Elena Cohen, and John Hutchins

and highlights of the Seminar held on June 23, 1995,
at 106 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC

Panelists: **Charles Ballard**, President, Institute for Responsible Fatherhood and Family Revitalization, Washington, DC
James Levine, Director, the Fatherhood Project, Families and Work Institute, New York
Edward Pitt, Director, Male Involvement Project, Families and Work Institute, New York
David Pate, Consultant, Father Policy Institute, Family Resource Coalition, Chicago
Gordon Berlin, Senior Vice President, Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, New York
Moderator: **Theodora Ooms**, Executive Director, Family Impact Seminar

This seminar was the first of two on fatherhood issues to be conducted by the Family Impact Seminar, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue, NW, Suite 209, Washington, DC 20036, (202) 496-1964. It was funded by the Ford Foundation.

Copyright © 1995, Family Impact Seminar, Washington, DC. All Rights Reserved.

This *Background Briefing Report* may be photocopied for education, teaching, and dissemination purposes, provided that the proper attribution is prominently displayed on the copies. If more than 50 copies are made, FIS must be notified in writing, prior to duplication, of the number of copies to be made and the purpose of duplication.

Disconnected Dads:
Strategies for Promoting Responsible Fatherhood

INTRODUCTION: WHAT IS THE POLICY PROBLEM? 1

Definition of responsible fathering behavior
Goals of the background briefing report

PART I: THE FATHERHOOD MOVEMENT 4

Connections with the men's movement
Four strands within the fatherhood movement

PART II: PREVENTION OF TEEN AND OUT-OF-WEDLOCK BIRTHS 11

Sex and family life education
School-based sex education programs
Community awareness campaigns
Male attitudes about contraception
School-based health centers
Male involvement in publicly-funded family planning agencies
Examples of prevention strategies targeted for men

PART III: RESPONSIBILITY TO PROVIDE ECONOMIC SUPPORT 19

Child support enforcement
System problems
Parental cooperation
Inability to pay
Promising strategies for promoting paternity establishment
Employment and training for non-custodial fathers

PART IV: CONNECTING FATHERS WITH THEIR CHILDREN 26

Fathers in Head Start and other early childhood programs
Family support and parent education programs
Involving fathers in maternal and child health programs
Involving fathers of children with special health care needs
Programs for troubled and vulnerable families
Fathers in schools
Balancing work and fatherhood
Lessons learned from father involvement initiatives

PART V: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 40

PART VI: RESOURCES AND REFERENCES 43

Electronic resources
Video resources
National, state, and local fatherhood organizational resources
References

PART VII: HIGHLIGHTS OF THE SEMINAR 60

TABLE: SUMMARY OF STRATEGIES 70

Disconnected Dads:
Strategies to Promote Responsible Fatherhood

A Background Briefing Report
by Theodora Ooms, Elena Cohen, and John Hutchins

INTRODUCTION: WHAT IS THE POLICY PROBLEM?

A growing number of men are not fulfilling their financial, moral, or social responsibilities to their children. The role of fathers as economic providers has captured most of the attention of policymakers and public alike. The current welfare reform debate, couched in terms of personal responsibility, spotlights father absence as a major cause of the high levels of family poverty and public dependency. Yet, fathers are also important to children in many non-economic ways. They love, nurture, teach, guide, and support their children. Sadly, an increasing number of children have little or no contact with their fathers and, in many cases, do not even know who they are.

This situation is described in David Blankenhorn's new book, *Fatherless America,* as America's "most urgent social problem" and by the recent *Kids Count Data Book* as justifying "national alarm." These and several recent publications present the stark facts documenting the dimensions of the problem (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 1995; Center for the Study of Social Policy, 1994; Furstenberg and Cherlin, 1991; Horn, 1995; Lerman and Ooms, 1993; McLanahan and Sanderfur, 1994):

- Between 1950 and 1994, the percentage of children living in mother-only families climbed from 6 percent to 24 percent. In 1990, 15.8 percent of children were living in households with no adult male (age 21+) present.

- This trend is occurring in cities, suburbs, and rural areas, and among all racial and income groups; in a growing number of neighborhoods, father-absent families are the norm. In 1990, census data show that 7.2 percent of children live in neighborhoods where more than half of all families with children are female-headed. In these neighborhoods, the majority of working-age men are unemployed for most of the year.

- It is estimated that legal paternity has been established for only about one-third of the children born out-of-wedlock. Only about two-thirds of non-custodial parents have obtained child support awards; of those with awards, only half receive the full amount they are due.

- Only 1 in 6 children of divorced and separated fathers see their fathers at least once a week, and paternal visits drop off sharply over time. After ten years, only 1 in 10 had weekly contact, and almost two-thirds had no contact at all.

- Nearly half of young unwed fathers reported that they visited their children initially at least once a week, and about a quarter said they visited almost daily; however, these contacts drop off sharply over time.

Why does father absence matter? A recent major review of the research concludes that father-absence has clear negative economic and psychological consequences for children, and is very costly for society. Regardless of whether single parents are never-married or divorced, their children are more likely to grow up in poverty, less likely to finish high school, more likely to experience sustained periods of idleness, and more likely themselves to have children as teenagers (McLanahan and Sanderfur, 1994). Other studies show that they are more likely to divorce.

The two primary factors that account for these differences in outcomes are that single parents have less money and less time to spend with their children than two parents. Also, children raised by single parents have less access to the resources of extended family and community and are more likely to move frequently.

Some studies and program experience suggest that there are two ways in which the high rates of father absence in the inner cities may contribute to the rising rates of young male violence, delinquency, substance abuse, and incarceration. First, inner-city young men who have grown up without fathers lack models for constructive male behavior. Second, while these young men admit that they make babies, their failure to connect with their children and be responsible fathers serves only to reinforce their social and personal alienation.

The bipartisan National Commission on Children, chaired by Senator Jay Rockefeller (D-WV), concluded in their final report in 1991, "Children do best when they have the personal involvement and material support of a father and a mother and when both parents fulfill their responsibility to be loving providers" (NCC, 1991: xix). However, while children raised solely by mothers are at significant risk, some single mothers overcome these odds and their children do well. And being raised by a single parent may sometimes be better for children than remaining in a home where the parents are in continuous, serious conflict.

Definitions of Responsible Fathering Behavior

Before reviewing the growing number of policy and program initiatives designed to promote responsible fatherhood, we need first to clarify the concept of responsibility. There appears to be a growing public consensus on separated and divorced fathers' legal, moral, and social obligations to their children. However, views differ on the extent of the responsibilities incurred by fathers who do not marry the mother of their child, and may never have even seen their child.

There is general agreement that "absent" fathers — whether separated, divorced, or never married — have the following responsibilities:

- The moral and social obligation to avoid fathering a child out-of-wedlock.
- The responsibility to establish legal paternity, which is increasingly being required by law.
- The legal, moral, and social obligation to pay child support.

- The moral and social obligation to develop and maintain a relationship with their children.

In addition, there is a growing awareness that both mothers and fathers who do not live together are responsible for cooperatively parenting their children.

In earlier days, if a man got a young woman pregnant he had a responsibility to marry her. Indeed, in the fifties and early sixties, non-marital conceptions were very common, but the births were "legitimated" by marriage. "Shotgun marriages" have clearly declined — leading to the rise in out-of-wedlock births — although certain segments of the community still value and promote such marriages.

Federal and state policy increasingly requires fathers to fulfill at least the minimum obligations of fatherhood: legally establishing paternity and paying child support. Public officials are also beginning to show some interest in identifying program and policy strategies designed to encourage and enable fathers to strengthen the non-economic bonds to their children. And a few voices are calling for an examination of current policies that may discourage marriage (Council on Families in America, 1995).

Goals of this Background Briefing Report

This Background Briefing Report aims to do two things. First, in Part I, we provide a rough "map" of the main elements of an emerging fatherhood movement, which provides the wider context for the discussion of policy and program initiatives. Second, in Parts II through IV, we draw on selected examples of innovative programs and initiatives across key program domains to illustrate strategies that federal and state policymakers can employ to encourage responsible fatherhood. We have organized these sections according to the three main dimensions of paternal responsibility: avoiding out-of-wedlock births, providing financial support, and building caring relationships with their children. In Part V, we include a list of key organizations and references.

For too long, family policy and family service programs have ignored or marginalized fathers. A focus on fathers is an essential component of strengthening and supporting families. Yet strengthening the father-child relationship should not be viewed as adversarial to the interests of mothers. As the programs described in this report show, mothers' tacit acceptance — preferably, their active support — is a prerequisite for fathers to be able to fulfill their responsibilities to their children, whether they live in the same household or not. However, too often the rights and needs of mothers and fathers appear to conflict and this cooperation may be very difficult to achieve.

In the second seminar in this series, we will discuss the complex and controversial legal and moral issues that develop between mothers and fathers in situations of divorce and unwed parenting, and what approaches, if any, can be used to reduce conflict and encourage cooperation. In addition, we will focus on the status of research about fathers — what is known and what more needs to be known about fathers and fatherhood.

PART I: THE FATHERHOOD MOVEMENT

(Sources: Blankenhorn, 1995; Bly, 1990; Majors & Gordon, 1994; Mincy, 1994a)

Note: All the organizations mentioned in this section are described briefly in Part VI, Organization Resources, p. 43.

In the week of Father's Day 1995, Vice President Al Gore held a high profile event at the White House to launch the Father-to-Father Initiative, a national campaign to encourage fathers to be "strong and positive forces" in their children's lives. In California, Governor Pete Wilson held a Fathers' Summit. Maryland held its second annual, day-long Male Involvement Conference for the state's human service providers. Earlier this year, the National Fatherhood Initiative began a tour of 30 cities with the goal of getting 10,000 men to rededicate themselves as fathers. David Blankenhorn's *Fatherless in America* generated considerable media attention. And tens of thousands of men are paying $55 a piece to attend Promise Keepers rallies in stadiums across the country and commit themselves to becoming more dedicated Christian fathers and husbands.

All of this very public activity is beginning to take on the shape of a fatherhood movement, albeit one with several distinct factions. For many years, strong, well-organized groups have vigorously advocated for father's rights in divorce and custody situations, generally representing the interests of middle and higher income men. Now, however, the interest in fathers has expanded in new directions, including work by several organizations focused on articulating the responsibilities, rights, and needs of low-income fathers, many of whom have never married.

The new wave of activities promoting responsible fatherhood has several origins, but its deepest roots come from programs like Charles Ballard's Institute for Responsible Fatherhood in Cleveland, which since 1982 has helped inner-city men take an active emotional and financial role in their children's lives. Another stronghold is the network of fathering programs in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, where at least seven projects designed for fathers have sprung up in the last ten years. Community-based fatherhood programs — often unaffiliated with larger institutions — have sprouted in cities and towns all over the country, and their growth has spawned national organizations, national and regional conferences, and books, magazines, videos, and other products for fathers and service providers.

In July 1994, Gore's Family Re-Union III conference in Nashville, Tennessee, which was subtitled, "The Role of Men in Children's Lives," brought together for the first time many of the leaders in the fatherhood movement with researchers and policymakers. Among the outcomes of the conference were the Vice President's Father-to-Father Initiative and the establishment of FatherNet, an electronic bulletin board for fathers, service providers, and policymakers, operated by the University of Minnesota's Consortium on Children, Youth, and Families.

Connections With the Men's Movement

The fatherhood movement is also connected to the larger Men's Movement, another broad term encompassing activities as diverse as men's self-actualization groups inspired by Robert Bly's *Iron John* (1990) — often satirized as drumming parties — the rallies of Promise Keepers, and the service work of Concerned Black Men. All of these disparate groups tap into a sense among some men that they have lost their identity in a changed world. To some extent, the men's movement is fueled by a backlash against the

achievements of the women's movement, and an undertone of male anger and frustration can be detected in some of the movement rhetoric, particularly in the fathers' rights groups. However, many of the men are drawn to these groups because of an earnest concern about how they can refashion a masculine role for themselves in a society that is changing its conception of what it values in men.

The growth of the men's movement has also been stimulated — not unlike the anti-affirmative action forces — by the economic uncertainties created by de-industrialization and corporate restructuring that have led to declining income and loss of job security for many men. This economic decline has reached crisis proportions in low-income, minority communities, particularly in the cities, causing increasing rates of violence, drug addiction, and incarceration.

Some organizations — like the Nation of Islam and Promise Keepers, for instance — place a strong emphasis on the importance of men fulfilling their traditional responsibilities as family leaders. In addition, especially in the African American community, the men's movement promotes the concept of men acting as mentors and role models to other young men or "fatherless" children, as Ron Mincy's recent *Nurturing Young Black Males* (1994) points out (see also Majors & Gordon, 1994).

However, it is concern about the dramatic changes in men's roles in the family that has most directly fueled the Fatherhood Movement and drawn the attention of policy officials. Forty percent of children live in a home without their biological father. According to the National Fatherhood Initiative, 55 to 60 percent of all children born in the 1990s can expect to spend part of their childhood in a fatherless home. David Blankenhorn asserts that "fatherlessness is the most harmful demographic trend of this generation."

All this attention paid to fathers' physical and emotional absence from their children's lives has led, in the absence of solid data and research, to blaming stereotypes — like "deadbeat dads" — that don't take into account the complexities of the causes of fatherlessness. Studies are underway to search for the multiple institutional, social, and cultural factors that influence these disturbing trends in family behavior. Policymakers and service providers, who are finally acknowledging the virtual absence of any father-focused initiatives in both publicly and privately funded services for children, youth and families, have begun to develop new policy strategies and approaches that help to reconnect fathers to their children and families, and to support and reinforce responsible paternal behavior.

Four Strands Within the Fatherhood Movement

Before describing some of these new approaches to promote responsible fatherhood, it may be useful to identify the four distinct, though overlapping, strands of the fatherhood movement:

1. **Fathers' Rights Groups** — These organizations will be discussed more fully in a second seminar on fathers, scheduled for later in the year, and are not listed in Part VI, Organizations.

2. **Programs for Fathers in "Fragile Families"** — Examples of some of the most innovative programs are detailed below in this section. (A more comprehensive list is available in Part VI, Organizations.)

3. **Public Information and Education Campaigns about Fatherhood** — These are described only briefly here. (More information about particular campaigns can be found in Part VI, Organizations.)

4. **Paternal Involvement in Family Service Programs** — These programs are described in detail in Part IV, Connecting Fathers with Their Children.

1. Fathers' Rights Groups

The oldest, most organized, and best-financed organizations in the fatherhood movement are concerned primarily with divorced and separated fathers' rights and needs. They offer information and advocacy to fathers in situations of separation and divorce, especially with respect to issues of child support and visitation. Politically, their voice is powerful, and they played a strong role in the establishment of the U.S. Commission on Children and Family Welfare and in shaping its agenda. The Children's Rights Council, a leading fathers' rights group, was founded in 1984 in Washington, DC, and has chapters throughout the nation. These groups take clearly articulated policy positions and have largely adversarial views toward mothers.

2. Programs for Fathers in "Fragile Families"

(Sources: Bartlett, 1995; Lewin, 1995; Mincy, 1994b; National Center for Fathering, 1995)

A newer strand of the fatherhood movement consists of the growing number of programs designed for low-income fathers. In response to the virtual absence of public or private services available specifically for young fathers, a number of innovative home-grown, community-based projects have emerged that seek to reconnect men to their children and to promote responsible paternal behavior. Most of these programs seek to reach the fathers of what Ron Mincy has termed "fragile families" — children born out-of-wedlock to low-skilled biological parents who do not legitimize their births by marrying or establishing legal paternity. The programs, whose participants are primarily African-American, typically offer a combination of intensive education, peer group discussions, training, and formal and informal mentoring to assist young men to assume their fathering responsibilities. According to Mincy, in contrast to the older fathers' rights groups, these programs have yet to develop a coherent policy agenda and access to policymakers. They also have not yet defined their relationship to the mothers of their clients' children.

Among the most successful of these programs are Charles Ballard's Institute for Responsible Fatherhood and Family Revitalization in Cleveland, the Responsive Fathers' Program of the Philadelphia Children's Network, and the Fathers' Resource Center in Minneapolis.

The Institute for Responsible Fatherhood and Family Revitalization
Founded in Cleveland in 1982 by Charles Ballard, the Institute recently announced the planned replication of its successful program in five additional cities by the end of 1995. Supported by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies and the Ford Foundation, the Institute will open centers in Nashville, Milwaukee, San Diego, Washington, DC, and Yonkers, NY.

Ballard's program targets young, unwed fathers, many of whom have dropped out of high school and have a history of substance abuse or trouble with the police. Participants in the

program —"proteges" — must agree to participate for at least a year, develop a work ethic, attain a high school diploma or GED, maintain a risk-free lifestyle, and establish paternity of any children born outside of marriage. It is an intensive program: proteges meet with an outreach specialist (often a graduated protege) 20 to 30 hours a month, usually one-on-one in the protege's home. The fathers receive intense, non-traditional, one-on-one support, group support, family outreach, fathering skills, health and nutrition information, medical and housing referrals, and educational and career guidance. A special component of the Institute's work is its outreach to incarcerated fathers, which seeks to improve the relationship between these fathers and their children and to deal with their eventual homecoming or permanent confinement. Each one of the Institute's replication sites will be run by a married couple with children who can model healthy, intact family relationships.

Results of a preliminary evaluation of the Cleveland site by researchers at Case Western Reserve University was very promising, with dramatic improvements reported by fathers in the time they spent with their children, improved relationships with their children's mothers, educational achievement, and employment status. A more rigorous evaluation is planned for the multi-site replication.

Contact: Charles Ballard, President, (202) 789-6376.

The Responsive Fathers Program/Philadelphia Children's Network
The Responsive Fathers Program helps young men develop the skills to support their children developmentally and financially. From 1991 to 1993, the program was one of six sites in an eighteen-month national demonstration, developed by Public/Private Ventures to enhance the capacity of young, unmarried fathers to become responsible and involved parents, wage-earners, and providers of child support.

Today, the program continues to provide 45 young fathers with peer support, parenting skills, and support in advancing their education and employment. Case managers link young fathers to resources and services and help them learn to negotiate the complexities of both social support systems and the work place. The Responsive Fathers Program also helps fathers and mothers learn to act as a team on behalf of their children, whether or not they remain involved as a couple. Over the coming months, the program will also begin an innovative literacy curriculum.

Contact: Thomas J. Henry, Director, (215) 686-3910.

Twin Cities — A Hotbed of Fatherhood Programs
Minneapolis-St. Paul, home of the Fathers' Service Network, a loosely organized consortium of service providers for fathers, may be the most active community in the nation for fathering programs. Led by the **Fathers' Resource Center,** a multi-site project, open since 1991, the wide range of activities primarily serves low-income fathers. Neil Tift, the Center's director, believes that it may be the most comprehensive fathers' program in the country. Its activities include:

- Male Anger Groups — eight-week courses, cofacilitated by an African-American and a European-American, to help men deal constructively with anger. Not for men with a history of violence.
- Understanding Abuse — a 15-week course for abusers, most ordered by courts to attend, conducted by a father and a domestic violence counselor.
- Family Law Clinics — sessions for 15-20 men provided pro bono by community lawyers.
- Dupont Residence — short-term transitional housing for fathers and their children. This is probably the only program of its kind in the nation, according to Tift.

- Parenting classes
- Support groups
- *Father Time*, a newsletter
- Local radio show
- Speakers' Bureau, which averages 30 presentations a month.

Contact: Neil Tift, Director, (612) 874-1509

Some of the other Twin Cities programs for fathers include:

- **African American Fathers Program**. This North Minneapolis program promotes school readiness for children, aged 0 to 6, by bringing African-American men back into the family system as strong leaders, caretakers, and role models. After a pilot project last year, the program will now expand to serve 100 men a year. Its services will include classes in child development, support groups, child care, and help for men in finding the resources to secure employment.

- **MELD for Young Dads**. Started in 1987, the MELD for Young Dads program has grown into a national parenting information and support program that addresses the needs of young fathers. The program reaches out to both custodial and non-custodial fathers, typically between 15 and 25 years old. MELD for Young Dads aims to prevent paternal neglect by helping young fathers handle the societal and interpersonal problems that can be barriers to involvement with their children. Through individualized service and group meetings, the program helps young fathers learn the skills for problem-solving, decision-making, and competent parenting. It is being replicated in cities around the country.

- **Minnesota Parents' Fair Share.** The Minnesota Parents' Fair Share (MPFS) Program was one of the pilot sites in the national demonstration program managed and evaluated by the Manpower Demonstration Resource Center. It serves non-custodial parents, usually fathers, who are unemployed or underemployed and who are behind in court-ordered child support payments to a custodial parent who receives AFDC. A total of 519 participants received program services from January of 1989 to December of 1993.

  The program is currently operated by Anoka County Jobs and Training and Dakota County Employment Training Center. MPFS combines employment and training services with enhanced child support enforcement, peer support, parenting education, and mediation services. Its goals are to improve the employment and educational opportunities of non-custodial parents, to increase child support payments and health insurance coverage provided by non-custodial parents to children living in poverty, to enhance their parenting and life skills, and to gain the support of the larger community.

To date, most of these programs have been designed for African-American fathers in inner cities, where the problem of father absence is most acute. Because they are home-grown and community-based, these projects developed in isolation with little opportunity for collaboration with innovators in other communities.

Recently, however, several national organizations are emerging to coordinate more structured forms of information exchange. Out of Vice-President Gore's 1994 Family Re-Union was borne the National Practitioners' Network, run by Ed Pitt of the Families and Work Institute in New York, and FatherNet, the electronic bulletin board, centered at the University of Minnesota. The National Center on Fathers and Families and the National

Center for Fathering are also at the forefront of research and information dissemination on programs for fathers.

An emerging goal of several of these organizations is to encourage the traditional national civic/voluntary organizations — especially those who work with youth in the inner cities, like the fraternal organizations, Boys and Girls Clubs, the Police Athletic Leagues and YMCAs — to rethink their programming to find ways to incorporate a focus on reconnecting fathers to their children. Several representatives from these service organizations were invited to the event launching Vice President Gore's Father-to-Father Initiative.

3. Public Information and Education Campaigns about Fatherhood

A fourth strand of the fatherhood movement includes national organizations and individuals who identify the "problem of fatherhood" as primarily cultural and social. Through public education and media campaigns, they seek to reorient the culture from the current devaluation and marginalization of fathers to one in which fathers are highly valued and supported. Their audience is broad, rather than targeted to specific sub-populations of fathers.

Some of these organizations, like the National Fatherhood Initiative, the National Center for Fathering, and Gore's Father-to-Father Initiative, develop outreach programs to convince men to rededicate themselves to their responsibilities as fathers. However, some differences of emphasis exist among fatherhood proponents. Whereas the primary message of David Blankenhorn's advocacy is to promote an ideal model of the "good [married] family man," other national fatherhood leaders, such as Wade Horn of the National Fatherhood Institute, seek to promote stronger father-child relationships among all kinds of fathers — whether married, never-married, separated, divorced, or remarried.

4. Paternal Involvement in Family Service Programs

A fourth cluster of organizations and initiatives encourage existing publicly funded institutions, service systems, and programs designed primarily for children and their mothers to incorporate a focus on involving fathers and, in the process, become more responsive to the rights and needs of fathers. As a result, a few innovative father-focused program and policy initiatives are taking place in family planning, Head Start and early childhood programs, maternal and child health projects, and schools — if even on a small scale. A stronger emphasis is being placed on fathers, especially unwed fathers, in welfare reform initiatives. Employers, too, are gradually developing more flexible policies designed to help fathers fulfill their family responsibilities. The organizations promoting this approach include the Fatherhood Project of the Work and Families Institute and the Father Policy Institute of the Family Resource Coalition.

This Background Briefing Report draws upon the experiences of these different fatherhood initiatives to present a variety of strategies that federal and state policymakers can use to promote responsible fatherhood. Although policymakers are clearly limited in their abilities to change long-standing social demographics, evidence suggests that there are many opportunities for programs and policies to encourage more responsible fathering behavior. But, unfortunately, there's been a singular lack of discussion of the variety of successful ways to promote more responsible fatherhood — beyond child support enforcement —

until recently. We hope that this seminar and report helps to encourage and broaden the discussion.

Since no comprehensive study exists of the extent to which fathers are involved in public program domains, we make no attempt to document how many fatherhood promotion initiatives exist. Therefore, in Parts II through IV, we simply highlight a few promising examples of initiatives in a wide range of program domains that could be more widely replicated.

PART II: PREVENTION OF TEEN AND OUT-OF-WEDLOCK BIRTHS

Women have always borne the greater burden of responsibility for the consequences of out-of-wedlock pregnancy. Historically, a young pregnant woman might be accorded some sympathy for being "taken advantage of" by a man, but, once the baby was born, she was stigmatized and the father was let off scot-free. However, among the middle class in this century, before abortion was legal or widely available, a young man was expected to legitimize an out-of-wedlock pregnancy by marrying the woman — giving him a strong incentive to accept responsibility for using contraception.

The responsibility for preventing pregnancy shifted to women in the 1960s when they gained reliable control of their reproductive capability through the pill, diaphragm, and IUD. With the sexual revolution thus launched, men, no longer expected to use condoms or to practice withdrawal, were essentially absolved from contraceptive decisions.

The enactment of the Family Support Act in 1988, with its requirement to establish paternity and enforce child support payment, has increased public awareness of the social significance of men's involvement in reproductive activities. In addition, the outbreak of AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases, the high rates of unintended pregnancy among teenagers, and the concern over the number of children living in households without fathers have shifted public attention to the need to target men in prevention activities.

The results of a 1994 Kaiser Family Foundation survey on public knowledge of and attitudes on contraception indicate that the overwhelming majority of woman feel most men do not assume enough responsibility for preventing unplanned pregnancies. The top two reasons they give are: "men don't care" and "men think that contraception is a woman's responsibility." When asked about actual behavior, the majority of women who use birth control (57 percent) say they alone are the one to make sure contraception is used. A third (35 percent) say the responsibility is shared with the partner. Only about 7 percent of the women say their partner alone takes the responsibility (Kaiser, 1995).

As part of the Alan Guttmacher Institute's recent project on enhancing male involvement in reproductive health, several experts contended that men are "reproductively unempowered" and will continue to be until society treats men as an integral part of reproductive health care and expects them to be included in contraceptive and reproductive decisionmaking. For example, Wayne Pawlowsky, director of training at Planned Parenthood of Metropolitan Washington, believes that current abortion law, which gives women the right to make all decisions about ending a pregnancy, may give men the message that pregnancy is not their responsibility.

Efforts designed to prevent out-of-wedlock childbearing fall into three major categories: (i) sex and family life education programs for youth, (ii) broad community and public awareness campaigns, and (iii) accessible contraceptive services and counseling.

Sex and Family Life Education

(Sources: Aydt et al., 1994; Bowman & Associates, 1991; Brown & Eisenberg, 1995; Garrison et al., 1994; Kirby, 1994; Males, 1995; Moore et al., 1995; Scales, 1981; Ooms, 1981)

Sex and family life education provided under public sponsorship continues to evoke considerable controversy. Although the debates are often focused on the content of sex education, the central question is: whose responsibility should it be to teach sex education

to children and adolescents? Formal programs are provided by schools, churches, community-based organizations, and residential programs (i.e., programs for incarcerated youth). In addition to these avenues, young people get their sex education from friends and other informal sources, such as films, television, and magazines.

It is widely accepted that sex and family life education programs should target young males as well as females. Little information is available about the extent to which the curricula in these programs focus on the consequences of unplanned pregnancy and births for males, including issues of paternity establishment and child support. Yet, increasingly some of these programs specifically target men.

For example in North Carolina, the Family Life Council of Greater Greensboro, Inc., a United Way agency sponsors the **Wise Guys** program for 10-19-year-old males. It consists of an eight-to-ten week program focusing on clarifying personal and family values, and promoting understanding of sexuality and responsible decisionmaking. It also includes a two-session program for parents on how to communicate with adolescent males about sexuality and family values.

Contact: Family Life Council of Greater Greensboro, Inc., (910) 333-6890.

School-based Sex Education Programs

During the last two decades, most junior and senior high schools have developed educational courses designed to reduce unprotected sexual intercourse, either by delaying the onset of intercourse or increasing the use of protection against STD and pregnancy. Over 93 percent of all public high schools offer courses on sexuality or HIV.

Reviews of the evaluations of school-based sex education programs conclude that a few well-planned and executed programs have demonstrated that sexual activity in young adolescents can be postponed and that use of contraceptives can be increased once sexual activity has begun (see Kirby, 1994, and Moore, et al., 1995). Successful programs include messages about the value of abstinence, skills training about communication between the sexes, resisting pressure to be sexually active, and the proper use of contraception once sexual activity has begun. Two programs in particular significantly delayed the onset of sexual activity among participants: Postponing Sexual Involvement and Reducing the Risk (both curricula are also used in other settings, such as churches, jails, etc.). These programs also increased the use of contraceptives among participants who initiated sex after the conclusion of the course. The Postponing Sexual Involvement curriculum places a strong emphasis on providing information about male responsibility and legal requirements regarding paternity and child support.

Community Awareness Campaigns

In the past decade, several states have launched public education and awareness campaigns designed to prevent teenage pregnancy and childbearing (Ooms & Golonka, 1992). In Maryland, for example, the Governor's Campaign on Adolescent Pregnancy designed an effective series of television ads that were a central component of a broad-based campaign. In North Carolina, the Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Coalition, a public-private partnership, provides information, training, educational materials, and technical assistance to local coalitions to mount a variety of prevention awareness activities and has become a

national model. Since 1990, these efforts have apparently succeeded in lowering the pregnancy rate. Contact: APPNC, (704) 335-1313.

Two national public awareness campaigns were specifically designed to encourage male sexual responsibility and make young men more aware of the consequences of teen childbearing for both partners. In 1985, the National Urban League (NUL) launched the Adolescent Male Responsibility Program, which had two major thrusts:

1. An award-winning, multi-media campaign, prepared as a public service by the Mingo-Jones advertising agency, targeted the Urban League affiliates and radio stations in the hundred top markets with the highest African-American populations. The posters included messages like: "Don't make a baby if you can't be a father." In addition, the NUL held three national conferences on manhood and fatherhood in African-American communities.

2. The NUL encouraged local affiliates to develop male responsibility programs. Nearly seventy of the local NULs initiated activities over a period of several years, designed to promote male responsibility; about half of them continue to operate. Several of the programs receive funding support from state and local sources.

The second nationwide campaign was the Children's Defense Fund's Preventing Children From Having Children, which developed a wide range of public education posters, some of them targeting men's responsibility — for instance, a photo of a young athlete holding a baby with the caption, "an extra seven pounds could keep you off the football team." Unfortunately, the impact of these campaigns has not been carefully evaluated.

Male Attitudes About and Use of Contraceptives

(Sources: Brown & Eisenberg, 1995; Edwards, 1994; Kaiser Family Foundation, 1995; Marsiglio, 1993; Pleck, et al., 1990, 1993a, 1993b; Sonenstein, et al., 1995; Sonenstein & Pleck, 1994)

Using data from two waves of the National Survey of Adolescent Males (NSAM), Sonenstein and her colleagues have been studying the levels of sexual activity among adolescent males in the United States; the relationship between sexual activity, condom use, and AIDS awareness; and the other factors related to condom utilization. These analyses indicate that condom use among sexually experienced teenage males more than doubled between 1979 and 1989. This rise in condom use was accompanied by a significant decrease in the proportion of males reporting no protection at last intercourse, either no method of contraception, or an ineffective method of contraception. Although it might appear that increased condom use would be the result of concern about AIDS and, perhaps, public health campaigns about the efficacy of condoms for protection, research indicates that the main reason men report using condoms is actually for birth control, not the prevention of STDs.

Sonenstein et al. (1995) presented the following evidence about factors related to consistency of utilization of condoms by young men:

- Teenagers' beliefs about the personal consequences of using condoms are related to their condom use. For example, if they think that they will be embarrassed buying or using condoms, they use them less consistently; anticipated loss of pleasure is one of the strongest correlates of condom non-use.

- Males use condoms more consistently when they believe that men *should* assume responsibility for contraception and when they do not think that a pregnancy will affirm their masculinity. Males disclaiming responsibility and seeking affirmation of manhood also tend to have traditional beliefs about masculine roles.

- One of the strongest correlates of consistent condom use is anticipating that the partner will appreciate this use.

School-Based Health Centers

(Sources: Kirby, 1994; Ooms & Owen, 1991; Sipe, 1994)

In 1994, relatively few (about 510) junior or senior high schools had school-based or school-linked health clinics. School-based health centers are located on school campuses, while school-linked health centers are located nearby and typically implement educational and other programs in the schools. Both types of health clinics provide students with a range of primary health care services, and, although they do not focus on family planning, they do provide reproductive health services. A few prescribe or dispense contraceptives. In appears that men and women are using school-based clinics in equal proportions.

A review of school-based health centers concludes that the proportion of all junior or senior high schools with school-based health centers is growing rapidly. Two studies indicate that the provision of reproductive health services (including the prescription or dispensation of contraceptives) either on campus or nearby does not hasten the onset of intercourse nor increase the frequency of intercourse. However, at this point, there is insufficient or inconsistent evidence to determine their impact upon contraceptive use, pregnancy rates, or birth rates.

A note of caution: Figures released by the National Center for Health Statistics and the California Center for Health Statistics (Males, 1995) indicate that 71 percent of the births among mothers ages 10-18 across the nation in 1992 were fathered by post-high school adult men (for those births for which fathers ages were stated). This information raises important questions about using schools for teen-targeted prevention efforts. It suggests a critical need for educational programs that target out-of-school teenagers and young adults, who are more likely to engage in risky behavior of all kinds and may be more resistant to standard public health and prevention messages.

Male Involvement in Publicly-funded Family Planning Agencies

(Sources: Bowman and Associates, 1991; Donovan, 1991; Henshaw & Torres, 1994)

There is no question that family planning agencies have helped to provide low-cost contraceptives for many women, as well as a few men. In 1993, approximately 2,600 agencies provided services in at least 5,500 clinics throughout the nation operated by state health departments (52 percent), Planned Parenthood affiliates (15 percent), hospitals, and other agencies.

Family planning clinics receive financial support from a number of federal programs, including Title X of the Public Health Services Act, which is specifically devoted to supplying family planning services to low-income women ($110 million), and Title V, the maternal and child health (MCH) block grants and the social services block grants. In

addition, substantial Medicaid funds reimburse providers of contraceptive services in clinics, physicians' offices, and other settings. The states, besides providing their share of Medicaid funding, allocated an additional $155 million in state monies to family planning clinics.

Although most family planning clinics around the country offer some form of male involvement (counseling/education sessions, pamphlets or films dealing with male issues, condom distribution, vasectomies), males are clearly at the fringes of family planning services. Very few men turn to family planning clinics or health personnel for contraceptive supplies. In the 1991 follow-up interviews for the National Survey of Adolescent Males, for example, only 3 percent of all 17-21-year-old males — but 9 percent of black males — indicated that they had obtained the last condom they used from a clinic or a physician.

While Title X family planning programs are apparently interested in having male participants, it is estimated that only about 2 percent of Title X program clients in 1991 and 2 percent of Medicaid family planning recipients in 1990 were, in fact, male. Family planning programs report distributing large numbers of condoms, but the men who receive them are not recorded in the system. In addition, family planning programs usually offer male sterilization, which is not an attractive option for the young people who make up the bulk of Title X participants (two-thirds are under 25 and one-third are adolescents).

By the same token, since Medicaid eligibility is based primarily on participation in AFDC or recent program expansions to low-income pregnant women, it is not surprising that few males receive family planing services through Medicaid.

However, a general acknowledgment that men are not being served appropriately by the family planning system has generated a few efforts to increase the participation of males in family planning agencies. Unfortunately, the decline in public investment in family planning services (especially those services supported by Title X of the Public Health Service Act), in the face of higher costs and sicker patients, may make it very difficult to expand services to men.

In the sources reviewed for this report, the following suggestions were made about successful approaches to involving males:

- Condom promotion efforts must address male and female cultural attitudes toward masculinity (for example, presenting condom use as, in part, an expression of a male's caring for his partner). Also, interventions that promote better communication between the sexes and that encourage women to ask their partners to use condoms may be more effective in the long term.

- Serving males should be part of the central mission of family planning agencies. Staff training is an absolute requirement for any male involvement program. Agencies are often confronted with logistical barriers that mask the staff's reluctance and even hostility towards serving males (for example, a lack of men's restrooms or fears about too much male traffic outside exam rooms where female patients are disrobing).

- The agency environment must become male-friendly. Family planning agencies are designed with women in mind and typically only employ female staff. The goal of a successful male involvement program in family planning clinics is to integrate male and female services — that is, to normalize the idea that both males and females are being served. The physical surroundings of the clinic must be

evaluated in term of comfort level for potential male participants. All agencies should have quality education materials aimed at males, and, even if they don't serve men, there should be a "partner's package" for males. Some family planning programs have encouraged male involvement by designing a special program with extra emphasis on men. For example, some agencies designate one night a week as "men's night."

Examples of Prevention Strategies Targeted to Men

The following are several examples of public and private initiatives for preventing teenage and out-of-wedlock births that are specifically targeting men.

Teen Pregnancy Prevention Initiative for California
In his 1995-1996 state budget, Governor Wilson proposed a $12 million initiative to enhance efforts to reduce the number of teen pregnancies, as well as the human, medical, and social services costs associated with teen pregnancy. The proposal is now being discussed in the state legislature. The Governor's initiative includes a $5.5 million Promoting Male Responsibility in Teen Pregnancy Prevention component, which includes:

- a multi-media campaign to be conducted in the state's high teen pregnancy areas, which will encourage young adult males to adopt responsible behaviors and which will seek to increase public awareness of the role and responsibility of males in preventing teen pregnancies;
- community-based education, information, counseling, and clinical services targeting high-risk adolescent and adult males;
- a new male education curriculum on a broad spectrum of social and health issues, including messages highlighting the fiscal, social, and legal obligations associated with teenage pregnancy;
- clinical demonstration projects for high-risk sexually active men; and
- a pilot project in the Office of Criminal Justice Planning to prosecute violators of existing statutory rape laws.

Contact: Terese Ranieri, Department of Health Services, Office of Family Planning, Sacramento, CA, (916) 634-0357.

Plain Talk Initiative
This is a four-year initiative of the Annie E. Casey Foundation that is providing $5 million to six communities: Atlanta, San Diego, Hartford, New Orleans, Seattle, and Indianapolis. During the first phase of the project, the communities received $150,000 to implement a planning process aimed at assisting adults develop clear messages and effective strategies for encouraging the use of contraceptives. The product of this phase was an implementation plan describing the community's strategy for protecting sexually active youth over the subsequent three years.

Plain Talk sites were expected to use a set of benchmarks to guide their activities, which included the involvement of adolescent and adult males in the programs. Some of the communities made special outreach efforts to men.

- In the public housing communities targeted by the **New Orleans Plain Talk Initiative,** housing and welfare policies were biased against intact families, and, as a result, many males were shut out of their homes, could not obtain services from the education and health care systems, or find employment, and were generally left out of the decision-making process of the community. The project hired a community male to coordinate and emphasize male involvement in community conversations. In "male only conversations," men discuss sexuality issues, especially focusing on condom usage.

- The **Hartford Plain Talk/Hablando Claro Initiative** developed a males-only program that uses the Always on Saturdays model, which consists of discussion groups of young men who meet each Saturday for two hours with an adult male who is skilled in working with inner-city young men around issues of sexuality and pregnancy prevention.

Contact: Debra Delgado, The Annie E. Casey Foundation, (410) 547-6600.

The Family Planning Council of South Eastern Pennsylvania
This is a private, non-profit organization that administers federal and state funds for family planning services to low-income residents of southern Pennsylvania. The Council is the sole representative for the delegate agencies for awarding Title X grants and/or governmental contracts for publicly-funded family planning services.

The Council has developed special male programs in three of their programs:

1. Community level media awareness. The media campaign, *Pregnancy is Not For Me*, targeted to middle and high school students, placed a strong emphasis on promoting responsible behaviors in men and women. Posters and other materials were presented at youth activities, such as concerts, sports events, and after-school programs.

2. School-based programs of condom distribution. These drop-in centers in schools, staffed by personnel from the health department, are very popular among teens; about 60 percent of users are men.

3. Clinics providing male family planning services, linked with other health agencies in the area. They promote vasectomy as a safe sterilization method for older men.

Contact: Roberta Herceg-Baron, Assistant Director, Family Planning Council of SE Pennsylvania, (215) 985-2600.

Mary's Center for Maternal and Child Care, Inc., Washington, DC.
This center provides prenatal and well-baby care, as well as a range of health education services to Latino families with young children. With funds from the Office of Adolescent Pregnancy Programs, Mary's Center operates a program for pregnant teens in which they tried to involve the fathers. Staff in the Para Ti program found that they need to start working with young men before they leave high school and so developed a special program of outreach to schools and school-linked health centers.

This program is staffed by volunteers (from private corporations) who work with teen men at the center and provide them with health education, E.S.L. classes, computer access, peer group discussion, and sports activities. The discussion groups focus on cultural attitudes about manhood and its relation to number of children, prevention of AIDS, role of men,

family planning, and fatherhood responsibility. They have mixed groups (fathers/non-fathers) in which the fathers share their fatherhood experiences.

Contact: Maria Gomez, Executive Director, (202) 483-8196.

PART III: RESPONSIBILITY TO PROVIDE ECONOMIC SUPPORT

(Sources: Lerman and Ooms, 1993; Mincy and Sorensen, 1994; Myer, 1992; Ooms & Owen, 1990; Ooms & Weinreb, 1992; Sorensen, 1995; U.S. Commission on Interstate Child Support Enforcement, 1992)

Policymakers' main interest in fathers arises from the obligation of parents to financially support their children, which is required by state law. The story of the struggle to get absent fathers to pay child support is long and tortuous, and efforts have had only modest success to date. Only about two-thirds of all the women eligible for child support awards actually have them in place. (Divorced mothers are four times as likely as never-married mothers to have award orders.) Of these, only about half receive the full amount they are due; a quarter receive no payment at all.

The child support situation is considerably worse for welfare clients. It is difficult to obtain precise numbers, but of single mothers who receive AFDC and/or Medicaid, about two-thirds of the 30-35 percent with awards report that they received some or all of the payments they were due. In other words, at least three-quarters of the welfare families received no support at all.

The federal government first became seriously involved with this topic in in the early 1970s in response to the growing numbers of single-parent households. Senator Russell Long (D-LA), concerned with the rising costs of the AFDC program, identified non-payment of child support as a national disgrace. In 1975, President Ford signed the original legislation which created an Office of Child Support Enforcement within the then-HEW. As amended in 1984 and 1988, the law authorizes federal matching funds to be used by states for enforcing the child support obligations of non-custodial parents — including locating absent parents and collecting child and spousal support.

For years, proponents of child support reform were almost solely interested in separated and divorced families, neglecting the needs of families in which the children were born out-of-wedlock. Reflecting the increased attention being paid to unwed fathers in research and programs, and the realization that out-of-wedlock childbearing accounts for the bulk of long-term welfare expenditures, policymakers began to pay more attention to paternity establishment. Although unwed fathers were not separately named, several provisions of the 1988 Family Support Act encouraged states to make stronger efforts to establish paternity. In 1993, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA) Amendments required all states to set up voluntary in-hospital paternity procedures.

Paternity and child support services are available to non-AFDC families for a fee. Basic responsibility for running these programs is left to the states, but the federal government has assumed an ever-larger role in funding, monitoring, and evaluating state programs and providing technical assistance.

Child Support Enforcement System Problems

(Sources: Achatz and MacAllum, 1994; Bloom and Sherwood, 1994; Danziger, et al., 1993; Ooms & Weinreb, 1992; U.S. Commission, 1992; Wattenberg, 1993)

Child support is an issue that will touch the lives of the majority of Americans at some time over the course of their lives, either as a child in a single-parent household or as a parent who owes or receives child support. Public outcry against non-paying dads and sympathy for custodial mothers and their children are inflamed by the publicity given to outrageous

cases — mother and kids living in poverty while the father makes regular payments on his Mercedes but pays no child support, or the low-income dad who fathers several children out-of-wedlock and then lives off their mothers' welfare checks.

Such anecdotes oversimplify the complex challenge policymakers face in administering an effective child support enforcement system. Regular payment of child support requires a series of interlocking steps and conditions involving the performance and cooperation of several branches, departments, and levels of government. Further, now that automatic wage withholding for all new support orders is possible, employers are also involved.

Before a custodial mother receives support payments, several steps must be completed. If separated or divorced, she has to be awarded a specific amount of support by a court or administrative order. If not married to the father, paternity must first be legally established followed by a support order. Thus, the national problem of child support is not simply a question of making fathers pay what they owe. It is a compound result of problems in four separate, related areas:

1. failure to establish legal paternity for children born out-of-wedlock,
2. failure to establish support awards, especially for the never-married,
3. nonpayment of awards, and
4. low dollar award amounts.

Even with the full cooperation of one or both parents, non-payment can be the result of system failures at each of these stages. The rates of paternity establishment and child support differ tremendously from state to state and county to county, even when comparing areas with similar demographic and economic characteristics. This strongly suggests that the problem of non-payment often arises from system failure. Garfinkel et al. (1995) suggest that a careful study of the policies and implementation practices in states that are most successful should reveal how better to enforce child support nationally.

Over the years, numerous child support reforms have been enacted to improve the performance of the enforcement system. These reforms include the adopting state guidelines for setting award amounts, simplifying methods of automatically updating and adjusting awards when income rises and falls, simplifying and instituting civil paternity procedures, and structuring requirements and incentives for public officials to pursue non-payors (see Ooms & Weinreb, 1992). Current legislation before Congress includes provisions to set up a national system of local case registries to track non-paying parents when they change jobs and move to other states, as well as proposals to apply wage withholding to federal employees.

Interestingly, as the current consensus on child support reform legislation pending in the 104th Congress illustrates, child support appears to be an area where strong federal prescriptive action receives bipartisan support — counter to the general trend toward deregulation and devolution in public policy.

In addition to system problems, two other complex issues are barriers to fathers' payment of support — lack of parental cooperation and the non-custodial parents' inability to pay. We offer several examples of new initiatives that are attempting to overcome these barriers.

Parental Cooperation

(Sources: Achatz and MacAllum, 1994; Bloom and Sherwood, 1994; Danziger et al., 1993; Lerman and Ooms, 1993; Pate, 1995; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991; Wattenberg, 1993)

Cooperation from the custodial parent — typically the mother — is the basic condition for effective child support enforcement. Before paternity can be established, the woman must inform the man that she is pregnant or has already borne his child, and then she needs to take action to pursue legal paternity and child support.

However, studies show a surprising lack of interest from some custodial mothers in pursuing child support. The 1989 census survey found that, of the mothers who did not have awards, about 40 percent reported that they either "did not want an award" or "did not pursue an award" (U.S. Census, 1991, p. 17). The reasons for mothers' non-cooperation are not well understood. AFDC mothers are required to cooperate with the child support authorities and name the fathers as a condition of receiving their check, unless they have a good-cause exemption (generally applied in cases of rape, incest, or where the mother's safety may be threatened).

By the time she applies for AFDC, the young mother typically has ended her relationship with the father and is often involved with another man. In some cases, the mothers genuinely do not know where the father is (in 1989, 13.6 percent mothers surveyed said that they were unable to locate the father.). In other cases, she or her family may have other strong personal reasons why they do not want the baby's father involved in their lives.

The Young Unwed Fathers and Fair Share Demonstrations and other fatherhood programs report that while most fathers have not established paternity legally, many of them are intermittently involved with their child, providing sporadic payments or in-kind gifts, and often helping to take care of him or her. But the system is structured so that there are many disincentives to the couples to cooperate. For example, if the father pays child support officially it goes to the welfare office, and a maximum of $50 a month is passed through to the child's mother. However, if he pays support directly to the mother, "under the table," he gets the satisfaction of and credit for helping support his child. When he pays support to the welfare office, the mother (and child) typically are not even informed that he is paying what he owes.

In addition, young fathers are not well-informed about their rights and about how to make the system work for them. Because their incomes are often erratic, they fear that if they should lose their jobs once they get caught up in the formal system, support arrearages would build up.

In summary, young welfare parents who want to maximize the benefit of the father's support prefer to avoid getting entangled with the formal child support system — which many resent anyway.

Similar findings explain why so few fathers establish paternity legally. Young people are generally ignorant of the benefits that accrue to children from establishing paternity. Fathers, wary of financial obligations, may be unaware of the rights they gain by becoming the legal father. Health care professionals and social workers, whom the couple have contact with around the time of birth, seldom mention the subject of paternity. In addition, establishing paternity in many jurisdictions is a cumbersome, time-consuming, and quasi-punitive procedure that young parents understandably prefer to avoid.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Inability to Pay

(Sources: Mincy & Sorensen, 1994; Myers, 1992; Pirog-Good, 1993; Sorensen, 1994)

Willful non-payment of child support is only one of a number of reasons for non-payment. A major reason many fathers cite for non-payment is their lack of sufficient income. They may be poor themselves — unemployed or underemployed — and/or they may have established new families whose needs for support drain their resources.

Until recently, little nationally representative data about the income and other characteristics of non-custodial fathers existed to help establish which groups of fathers had the greatest inability to pay. Most of the studies gathered data about separated and divorced fathers, and most were cross-sectional studies, focusing on incomes at one point in time, usually around the time of divorce or separation. A basic problem with much of the self-reported data is that men tend to underreport whether or not they are non-custodial fathers.

Myers (1992) offers a useful summary of the results of 14 studies of the income of non-custodial parents, each using different samples and definitions of income. The range of reported incomes of non-custodial fathers varied quite widely, ranging from $7,626 in a sample of the fathers of AFDC children in North Carolina to $33,810 in a national sample of older, remarried fathers. Studies using state specific data to examine non-custodial fathers with non-marital births who have recently entered the system find that the average non-custodial father with a child born out-of-wedlock has less than half the income of the average divorced father (Sorensen, 1994: 7).

A new analysis of a national longitudinal survey, the 1990 Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), sheds some light on the question of ability to pay by comparing the circumstances of custodial mothers with non-custodial fathers (Mincy & Sorensen, 1994; Sorensen, 1994). The study identifies four types of non-custodial fathers:

1. **turnips** (as in "you can't squeeze blood from a turnip"): those who did not pay child support in 1990 and were deemed unable to pay child support. The study estimates that between 15-35 percent of young non-custodial fathers fall into this group, with substantially more blacks (up to 60 percent) being turnips than whites. (The percentage range derives from the two different weighting procedures the researchers used to assess underreporting).

2. **deadbeats:** those who did not pay child support in 1990 but were deemed able to pay (33-43 percent).

3. **impoverished payers:** those who paid child support but were seemingly unable to pay. (Between 2-3 percent of young non-custodial fathers fall into this group.)

4. **payers:** those who paid child support and were able to pay (30-40 percent).

Inability to pay support was defined as having a personal income below $6,800. This figure was close to the incomes of the custodial mothers with whom the study assumed the fathers mated and with whom they shared similar characteristics in terms of poor education, low skills, and scant job experience.

The authors point out that there is considerable diversity among non-custodial fathers, a diversity that, in many respects, matches that among custodial mothers. However, child

support reform tends to treat most fathers and families in the same way. The authors conclude that there is probably some room — although not much — for increased child support enforcement to alleviate poverty among young, custodial mothers without impoverishing young, non-custodial fathers. Obviously, it is not enough to impose child support obligations and punitive sanctions, such as fines and jail, on the "turnips" who are unable to pay. These non-custodial fathers must have access to employment, training, and other services that they will need to meet their child support obligations.

Child support officials have typically been reluctant to pursue support from young unwed fathers, since they knew that most of them had so little income. However, though little longitudinal data is available, a few studies suggest that over time these young men's income is likely to increase. Therefore, some have argued that courts should establish token or in-kind support orders to encourage the habit of payment, which can then be increased at a later date when income rises. In 1986, the Teen Alternative Parenting Program in Indianapolis mounted a demonstration program designed to explore alternative mechanisms for payment of child support by young absent fathers, such as token awards and in-kind support (Pirog-Good, 1993).

We provide examples below of promising strategies for improving paternity establishment and child support payments among low-income fathers. In both areas, the success of these efforts depends in part on whether there is a strong public consensus about the importance of parental financial responsibility and whether this value is reinforced and supported by actions at the community and service provider levels. The new national fatherhood public education and awareness campaigns described above should make a useful indirect contribution to these goals.

Promising Strategies for Promoting Paternity Establishment

(Sources: DHHS/OCSE, 1992a, 1992b, 1994; Sonenstein, Holcomb, & Seefeldt, 1990; Williams, forthcoming)

In 1992, the Office of Child Support Enforcement made instituting paternity a priority and compiled a report describing a flurry of legislative and program initiatives states had undertaken to streamline and/or expedite the paternity establishment process. These include simplifying and decriminalizing the process, instituting voluntary consent procedures that were easily accessible, and conducting information exchange and outreach efforts. The realization that up to 80 percent of unwed fathers visit their baby in the hospital led to the conclusion that paternity efforts would be much more successful if instituted at an earlier stage, namely around the time of birth. Two states, Washington and Virginia, began in-hospital, voluntary paternity establishment programs in 1989-1990. Initial results were promising as paternity rates increased somewhat.

In the OBRA of 1993, states were required to adopt procedures for voluntary acknowledgement of paternity, including early paternity establishment programs in hospitals. Final regulations were issued on December 23, 1994. States must provide information to both parents about the benefits of paternity establishment for the child, the obligations it implies, and the fathers' due process rights. States are also encouraged to provide this information in prenatal care clinics.

It is too early to report on how states are implementing this requirement and what the results are. Each state — and within each state, each hospital and birthing center — is implementing this requirement somewhat differently. Some early lessons are emerging from Denver and New York City, which obtained special federal demonstration grants, and

from Massachusetts. In Massachusetts, which is collecting very good data, it appears that almost two-thirds of all unmarried parents will voluntarily acknowledge paternity, if presented with the opportunity to do so. In other jurisdictions, early results are more disappointing. The primary reason for Massachusetts' success appears to be the cooperative efforts of the Massachusetts child support IV-D office and the Department of Public Health to integrate the program with the existing birth registration system. The young couple is informed of the acknowledgment option when completing the birth certificate, which can be accomplished in the city or town clerk's office after the mother and child have returned home.

Connecting Employment and Training with Father Involvement for Non-custodial Fathers: A Promising Strategy for Improving Payment of Child Support

Given the lack of constructive alternatives within the present child support enforcement system for dealing with many non-custodial fathers' inability to pay support, there has been a growing interest in developing new approaches. Two multi-site demonstrations have explored new ways of providing employment, training, and other services to non-custodial fathers. This approach is attracting the attention of state and federal officials as an additional welfare reform strategy (Offner, 1995).

The Young Unwed Fathers Pilot Project

Between 1991-1993, Public/Private Ventures conducted a pilot project in six cities to explore whether and how programs can improve the capacity of young men to care for their children, both as providers and as parents. The major goals of the Young Unwed Fathers project included: (i) to improve or reinforce parenting skills of the young fathers, (ii) to increase the employment and earnings potential of young fathers, and (iii) to motivate young fathers to declare legal paternity for their children and pay child support.

Participants were all motivated to do right by their children, and the majority had regular contact with them and typically provided support in the form of goods and services. Much was learned about some of the personal, relationship, and system disincentives and barriers these young men face, their discouragement about employment, and the difficulties they had communicating and cooperating with their children's mothers (see Achatz and MacAllum, 1994).

The project staff developed a Fatherhood Development Curriculum to use in group discussion sessions with the young men, which P/PV continues to use in training staff in fatherhood programs around the country.

Contact: Emma Meredith, Public/Private Ventures, (800) 755-4778, ext. 4464.

Parents Fair Share Demonstration

In 1994, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), the Department of Labor (DOL), and the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) launched a seven-site demonstration, the Parents Fair Share Demonstration (PFS), to test the results of providing employment and training services, support for father involvement, enhanced child support enforcement, and mediation services for unemployed non-custodial parents whose children receive AFDC.

Designed and evaluated by the MDRC, the central goals of the PFS are to reduce poverty among children receiving AFDC by encouraging and requiring their fathers to establish

paternity and pay child support, to increase the earnings of non-custodial parents who are unemployed and unable to adequately support their children, and to assist non-custodial parents in providing other forms of support to their children, when appropriate.

The sites participating in the demonstration phase of the project, where a random assignment research design is being used, are: Grand Rapids, MI, Dayton, OH, Trenton, NJ, Memphis, TN, Springfield, MA, Jacksonville, FL, and Los Angeles County, CA. The project represents a unique public/private partnership between three federal departments (DHHS, DOL, and the Department of Agriculture), several private foundations (Pew Charitable Trusts, W.K. Kellogg, Annie E. Casey, Charles Stewart Mott, Ford, McNight, and Northwest Area), and the MDRC, a nonprofit organization. MDRC was selected to coordinate the demonstration and conduct a five-year evaluation with funding from the federal government and several private foundations.

The PFS demonstration builds on the experiences of an 18-24 month, multi-site pilot phase designed to test the feasibility of the approach. The result of this pilot was encouraging enough to warrant launching the full-scale demonstration. The pilot phase confirmed that traditional enforcement tools are not sufficient for this population of fathers since many non-custodial parents of AFDC children do not pay because they have no income.

The four core components of the project are: employment and training services geared to helping the participants obtain secure long-term, stable employment that will allow them to support themselves and their children; enhanced child support enforcement; lasting father involvement; and mediation between the parents.

The MDRC report of the pilot demonstrations revealed many interesting lessons, including the fact that the PFS programs pushed the local child support systems to shift their focus from maximizing immediate support collections to making investments in the non-custodial parents in the hope of increasing their ability to pay later on. In learning to cooperate with the program, the system temporarily reduced the child support obligations during the period of PFS participation.

Contact: Gordon Berlin, MDRC, (212) 532-3200.

PART IV — CONNECTING FATHERS WITH THEIR CHILDREN

(Sources: Horn, 1995; Lamb, 1994; Lamb, forthcoming; National Center for Fathering, 1995; O'Connell, 1993; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991)

Making sure that fathers assume their financial responsibilities for their children is only one way that policymakers encourage responsible fatherhood. Increasingly, programs that provide health, education, and social services to children are devising strategies to encourage fathers to take active roles in their children's lives. The awareness of the importance of including fathers in family policy comes, in part, from a growing body of research demonstrating the key roles fathers play in child development and from studies showing that, when fathers are involved in positive ways, program goals for children are more likely to be achieved. (An examination of the status of data and research on fathering will be a focus of a second seminar on fathers to be held later this year.)

Further evidence of the benefits of involving fathers comes from the experience of some of the programs profiled in this *Background Briefing Report* that show that if a father is reconnected with his children he may be motivated to get job training, get off drugs, find a job, or provide financial support to his children. Although less tangible and harder to measure than dollars, the nurturance of father/child relationships is every bit as valuable.

The National Center on Fathers and Families (NCOFF) at the University of Pennsylvania has identified seven "core learnings" gleaned from the experiences of programs and agencies serving fathers:

1. Fathers care — even if that caring is not always shown in conventional ways.
2. Father presence matters — in terms of economic well-being, social support, and child development.
3. Joblessness is a major impediment to family formation and father involvement.
4. Existing approaches to public benefits, child support enforcement, and paternity establishment create obstacles and disincentives to father involvement. The disincentives are compelling enough to result in a phenomenon dubbed "underground fathers" — men who acknowledge paternity and are involved in the lives of their children but who refuse to participate as fathers in the formal system.
5. A growing number of young fathers and mothers need additional support to develop the vital skills to share the responsibility for parenting.
6. The transition from biological father to committed parent has significant developmental implications for young fathers.
7. The behaviors of young parents, both fathers and mothers, are influenced significantly by intergenerational beliefs and practices within families of origin.

NCOFF has embarked on an ambitious practice-focused research agenda organized around these seven core learnings; as of the summer 1995, they have published three comprehensive databases of abstracts, annotations, and citations from a broad range of interdisciplinary studies (see Part VI, Resources and References).

In his review of the research on paternal influences on child development, Michael Lamb of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development concluded that across the three main areas of development studied — sex role development, achievement, and psychosocial development — children are better off when their relationships with their fathers are "close and warm." Interestingly, this was also true for their relationships between mothers and children, leading Lamb to conclude "the characteristics of the father as parent rather than the characteristics of the father as a man appear to be most significant." While this appears to contradict the argument put forth by some advocates that fathers must

reassert their traditional masculine role in the family, there seems to be little disagreement that children are more likely to succeed when their fathers are actively involved in their lives.

Some men *are* taking a more active role in the lives of their children. Increasing numbers of parents who both work are doing part-time or shift work, which permits fathers to provide child care while mothers work and vice versa. By 1991, one of every five preschool children (under age 5) were cared for by their fathers while their mothers worked outside the home, a sharp increase from 15% in 1988 (Census Bureau, 1991; O'Connell, 1993). And, according to James Levine's 1993 study for *Child* magazine, 80 percent of fathers want to take more of a role in parenting than their own fathers did (National Center for Fathering, 1995). Such evidence presents observers with a paradox: at the same time we are warned of the dangers of increased father absence, fathers seem to be participating in the care of their children at record levels.

This section explores the policies and program strategies developed to help encourage, support, and reinforce fathers building strong relationships with their children and fulfilling their roles as teachers, nurturers, protectors, and guides. The underlying question, which this section addresses, is what should be the role of federal, state, and local government programs in strengthening fathers' involvement with their children.

The reality is that most programs designed for children — whether in the public or private sector — assume that the mother is the primary, if not sole, caretaker. Thus, mothers are expected to accompany children to appointments, to be the repository of information about the children, and to know what services the children need and where to get them. And while it may not be unreasonable to assume that mothers are usually the primary caretakers, programs contribute to the fulfillment of generally low expectations regarding father involvement by not actively reaching out to fathers. These low expectations apply to fathers in intact families, but even more so to fathers who are absent from the household.

Even with the strong emphasis on parent involvement over the past decade — making services more family-centered, establishing family support programs — "parent" and "family" still usually mean "mother." Front-line providers, particularly those working with disadvantaged populations, may find getting any parent (mother) involved challenging, let alone aggressively seeking out a second parent (father). But despite the structural and attitudinal barriers that have prevented service providers from reaching out to fathers, a handful of projects in the family planning, maternal and child health, early childhood, early intervention and educational arenas demonstrate what can be done.

In the section that follows, we briefly review the recent developments in fatherhood initiatives in a wide range of program domains. Not intended as an exhaustive survey, our review highlights innovative efforts to involve fathers and suggests that these successful practices be institutionalized throughout the public service sector.

Fathers in Head Start and Other Early Childhood Programs

(Sources: Cohen & Ooms, 1994; Levine, 1994; Fagan, 1995)

Head Start, the child development program launched as an eight-week summer enrichment program for low-income children, currently serves about 800,000 children and families. Head Start was designed as a comprehensive program intended to address all aspects of children's lives — their physical and emotional health and social and intellectual development. In addition, Head Start has always emphasized providing a range of services

to families and a strong emphasis on the involvement of parents as volunteers, staff, and members of policy councils. However, most Head Start programs are staffed by women and have not been successful in recruiting men in the parent involvement and other components.

Head Start Male Involvement Projects

In 1991, the Head Start Bureau funded six three-year demonstration projects to develop and evaluate strategies for meaningfully involving male family members in the Head Start programs. These sites reach out to involve men who play significant nurturing roles in the lives of children enrolled in Head Start, including fathers, grandfathers, uncles, and other men in the household. Although the programs reported a high degree of success, and enthusiastic participation from the men, most were discontinued after the funding ran out.

The report of the Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion, (Advisory Committee, 1994) made several recommendations to strengthen the program's ability to provide more effective services to the whole family, including involving fathers. Many changes in the Head Start system are underway to implement the Advisory Committee's recommendations including revisions in the staff training and technical assistance components of the program, and also the performance standards are being substantially revised. These changes provide a golden opportunity to implement some of the lessons of the Head Start male involvement projects, and institute working with fathers and other males as a standard practice throughout the Head Start system. While the opportunity exists, it is unclear whether strong efforts are being made to integrate the lessons from the male involvement demonstrations in the current evolution of the Head Start system.

Two of the projects are briefly described below:

Male Involvement Project, Philadelphia Parent Child Center

(Source: Fagan, n.d., 1995)

The objectives of this demonstration project were: (i) to develop strategies for involving men in all aspects of the Head Start program both as paid staff and as volunteers, and for maintaining the involvement over time; (ii) to investigate the impact of male involvement in Head Start on the men themselves; and (iii) to disseminate information about successful strategies in an effort to encourage other Head Start programs to implement male involvement programs.

One of the innovative strategies developed by this project was the empowerment-based program, Men as Teachers, to improve the parenting abilities of low-income, African-American men. Qualitative data obtained in interviews with men, women, and children indicate that men greatly benefited from participation. Men as Teachers provided an environment where African-American men could talk about parenting issues and obtain access to the democratic processes of their own community. In addition, men acquired a clear presence throughout the agency. They were seen as volunteers in the classrooms on a consistent basis and in all other facets of the program, including substitute teacher training sessions.

The Philadelphia PCC continues to support this program beyond the period of demonstration grant funding.

Contact: Will Thomas, Assistant Director, (215) 229-1800.

Project Head Start Involving Men (HIM), Trenton, New Jersey

Trenton is the site of another of the six Male Involvement Projects designed as a comprehensive program focusing on the involvement of males in Head Start. For years, the staff had noted that many of the Head Start families households did not provide the children with stable male role models. Therefore, they were eager to participate in the national Head Start demonstration program.

The project director hired a part-time male involvement specialist to recruit men into the program through one-on-one interviews with any men involved with the families. Among the 200 families enrolled in 1993, about 185 males were involved in some way in the program. They included biological fathers, grandfathers, boyfriends, and other male family members. The most successful aspect of the program were Info Shops — group discussion sessions. These focused on information geared to help fathers build self-esteem, understand child development, understand legal rights, plan parenthood, get continuing education, receive crisis intervention when needed, and find access to employment services and health care — including mental health and substance abuse. Another important aspect was informing the mothers about the program so they would not feel that men were "invading" their territory. The program also offered workshops for couples. Project HIM also developed activities to follow up with the men who had been participants and whose children left the programs to go to other schools.

Contact: New Jersey Head Start, (609) 586-5894.

Family Support and Parent Education Programs

(Sources: Allen, et al., 1992; Cohen and Ooms, 1994; Kagan, et al., 1987; Levine, et al. 1993; Powell, 1995; Staton, et al., 1991)

During the last two decades, there has been a proliferation of family resource centers, family support programs, and parent education programs. Because many of the current programs have grassroots origins, they differ considerably in the scope of the services they provide, setting, funding, and organizational auspices. Family support programs usually (i) share a strong orientation toward prevention, rather than remediation or treatment; (ii) provide social support (information, guidance, practical assistance, and emotional and peer support) to families living in a particular community, with no stringent eligibility criteria or in-take procedures; (iii) are tailored to the culture(s) of the families living in that community; and (iv) involve parents in determining the design of the program and in helping provide some of the services.

Traditionally, family support programs have worked with mothers — especially teen mothers — with young children. And there is very little information in the literature on parent education about how to tailor programs specifically to the needs of men and how to get them involved as participants in the programs. But a few family support programs are beginning to think of ways to involve fathers more in their program activities. The Family Resource Coalition, the national federation of organizations and individuals promoting family support programs, is launching a major public education campaign on involving fathers in local programs at their 1996 national conference, *Changing the Way America Works With Families*. A new project, the Father Policy Institute, recently joined the FRC network.

The following are two different models of family support programs that have specifically targeted fathers:

MELD para *Nueva Familia,* Minneapolis.
(Source: Powell, 1995)

Throughout the history of parent education in the United States, there have been scattered attempts to work with lower income populations of color, including Latinos. Two major barriers faced by Latino fathers in learning about parenting are: (i) that programs have been developed for well-educated, white fathers of young children and (ii) most staff serving Latino families — as well as the clients they serve — are women.

In addition, there is a limited amount of child development and family research on Latino populations when compared to research on whites and African-Americans. This is particularly true for Latino fathers. Two contrasting images of the Latino father are found in the existing literature: the traditional view casts him as a dominant, authoritarian figure in the family; an alternative view suggests a more egalitarian approach to decision making and greater levels of father involvement in childrearing. The second view seems to be supported by service providers working with Latino families with young children.

To adapt the MELD curriculum to be responsive to the needs and circumstances of Latinos, Douglas Powell designed and evaluated the program *Nueva Familia* in Los Angeles. The program, now available in both English and Spanish, includes issues of bilingual/biculturalism as well as recent immigration issues. Couples, singles, and adolescent Hispanic parents — including fathers — have been served with the MELD for Young Moms and Young Dads programs.

The programs learned that they must be sensitive to the following issues:

- the implicit and explicit assumptions of program staff regarding commitments to working with men;
- the interdependence of husbands' and wives' involvement in the program — often one serves as informal facilitator or gatekeeper of the other's participation;
- the program styles of helping that are compatible with men's problem-solving strategies and ways of relating to others;
- the implications for women of involving men in a parent program;
- the provision of unique and respectful roles for fathers in program routines;
- content that addresses survival issues for low-income immigrants in the dominant U.S. culture.

Contact: MELD, Minneapolis, MN, (612) 332-7563.

New York YWCA Young Fathers Program

Caring for teen-age mothers led the Young Women's Christian Association in New York to reach out and serve the young men who had fathered the children. The YWCA started a program of workshops and classes for the male partners of the young mothers they served. The program, serving about 100 mostly African-American fathers, from 16 to 25, offers academic instruction for high school equivalency diplomas and parenting education. Vocational and personal counseling are available, too. In addition, these fathers receive YWCA memberships and have access to the health, fitness, and recreational facilities.

Staff affirms that they are competing with the pressures and "easy money" of the streets, especially from the drug culture. Yet, they have developed effective approaches to engage and serve inner-city fathers who are the long-forgotten partners in the teen pregnancy/parenting epidemic. These fathers desire to become the fathers many of them never had. So far it has worked: over 70 percent of the young fathers who work in this program stay and actively pursue an education, job training, and their own parenting goals. At their 10th anniversary conference, *Young Dads: Present and Accounted For*, the keynote speaker was Congressman Kweisi Mfume, (D-MD), who became a father at 18. This program is funded by the NYC Board of Education, Department of Youth Services, Division for Youth, Vocational Foundation, YWCA of New City, and Private Donations.

Contact: Vivian Manning Fox, Executive Director, YMCA, (212) 735-9722.

Involving Fathers in Maternal and Child Health Programs

(Sources: Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs, 1991; COFO, 1992; Crowell & Leeper, 1994; Hendershot and LeClere, 1993; McCoy-Thompson, Vanneman, & Bloom, 1994; National Center for Education in Maternal and Child Health, 1995)

A growing body of research has documented the ways in which families impact the health of their members and how the health of one member affects the health of others in the family. A successfully functioning family contributes to the good health of both adults and children by creating an environment that promotes, teaches, and models good health, nutrition, lifestyle and safety practices; responds appropriately to symptoms of illness, knows how to access health care outside the home; and complies with medical advice and treatment regimens. Evidence is accumulating that when family members are involved by health professionals in the care of individual patients, health outcomes are improved. These research findings underscore the importance of involving fathers in the health care provided to their children, and also to their wives or women partners.

Children's health care providers traditionally interact more frequently with mothers than with fathers, since mothers usually take primary responsibility for their children. But at a time when ninety percent of married fathers now witness the birth of their children (30 years ago fathers rarely saw their children born) and when both parents are in the workforce, fathers are inevitably having more contact with the health care system.

Increasingly, health care providers are realizing the value of involving the fathers or partners in prenatal and post-natal services. Two studies of low-income women in Missouri provide data that strongly support the involvement of the male partner in the women's use of prenatal care (Sable, et al., 1990). First, the wantedness of pregnancy was a strong predictor of the use of available prenatal care. And the wantedness of pregnancy is closely related to the reaction of the pregnant woman's partner to the pregnancy and the impact of the pregnancy on their relationship. Second, the use of available prenatal care is significantly related to the help and support from the baby's father. While others close to the mother influence her use of prenatal services, none prove to be as significant as the baby's father or other male partner.

Several maternal and child health programs, notably the Healthy Start initiative to reduce infant mortality, have developed outreach and education campaigns for the male partners of the women they serve.

The Healthy Start Initiative

The Healthy Start Initiative is a national five-year demonstration program, funded through the Department of Health and Human Services Maternal and Child Health Bureau (MCHB), to reduce infant mortality and improve the health and well-being of women, infants, children, and families. In 1991, MCHB funded projects in 15 rural and urban sites in which infant mortality rates were 1.5 to 2.5 times the national average to develop coordinated, comprehensive, culturally competent models of health and other support services. Several of the sites have made concerted efforts to involve fathers in their programs. In addition to the programs cited here, Healthy Start programs in other communities, including Cleveland, Washington, DC, Northwest Indiana, and Pittsburgh, have also developed father involvement initiatives.

The **Baltimore Healthy Start** operates neighborhood health centers in two of the city's highest risk areas. One of the 16 program criteria established by Baltimore Healthy Start is a requirement that the centers involve fathers. The program reported that "providers initially found male involvement a foreign idea," but the program's community-based planning consortium came up with simple ways to make fathers feel welcome at the health centers, including:

- making copies of *Sports Illustrated* available in the waiting room,
- displaying pictures of positive images of men on the centers' walls, and
- requiring one male partner prenatal visit and two male partner visits for well-baby care during the first year.

Baltimore Healthy Start learned from previous community-based infant mortality programs that male partners wield a lot of influence with the mothers they serve. "If the information learned [by the mother] in the program differed from what her male partner was saying, the mother would not change," they observed. "Fathers should not be viewed as extensions of mothers, but as direct clients."

Contact: Barbara Squires, Director, Policy and Program Development, Baltimore Healthy Start, (410) 396-7318.

New Bridges to Improved Infant Health, Sinai Hospital of Baltimore
In close collaboration with the Baltimore Healthy Start program (the program director serves on the Healthy Start Consortium's executive committee), the New Bridges program has developed a special group for fathers, led by a male home visitor, that encourages their attendance at prenatal classes.

Contact: Pamela Young, Department of Women's and Children's Services, Sinai Hospital of Baltimore, (410) 578-5314.

Ko'olauloa Healthy Tomorrows, Oahu, Hawaii
As part of its effort to reduce barriers to good health care for Ko'olauloa's children and their families, the Healthy Tomorrows projects uses a social worker to help fathers increase their participation in caring for the health of their families by providing culturally relevant health promotion and education, outreach, home visits, and positive role modeling.

Contact: Loretta J. Fuddy, ACSW, MPH, Hawaii Department of Health, (808) 733-9022.

Involving Fathers of Children with Special Health Care Needs

The family of a child who has a serious physical or mental disability confronts unique economic, emotional, and physical challenges that exacerbate the already high stress produced by the birth of the child. The active involvement of a nurturing father can prove critical to the ability of the family to handle these challenges.

Like most public services to families, programs for those with special needs children are built around the needs of mothers, who are the more accessible parent. Even "family-oriented" programs continue to focus on the needs of families from the perspective of the mother (Crowell and Leeper, 1994). However, a number of efforts targeted to the fathers of special needs children have been developed, particularly as a result of the National Fathers' Network.

National Fathers' Network
The National Fathers' Network (NFN), supported in part by SPRANS (Special Programs of Regional and National Significance) grants from the Maternal and Child Health Bureau since 1986, advocates for fathers and families of children with special needs and provides them with support and information resources. According to James May, NFN director, the Network's efforts are targeted in three ways:

1. Father Support Programs — Because the greatest threat to healthy functioning by families with special needs children is the isolation they feel, the Network's first objective was to provide a place for fathers to talk to each other. NFN's primary father support projects are:

    - Demonstration Father Support Program in Bellevue, WA — Currently, 100 men participate in biweekly meetings for personal sharing, discussion of identified topics of interest (i.e., legal rights, advocacy, educational issues), father-child activities, and social functions.
    - Development of Father Support Programs — More than 60 programs in 36 states have been developed for fathers of special needs children. The Network offers outreach and staff development training.
    - Father-to-Father Mentoring Demonstration Project — This program assists fathers in providing one-to-one support and resource assistance to their peers.
    - The National Fathers' Network Newsletter — Written primarily by fathers, the newsletter is sent to more than 3,000 fathers and professionals throughout the U.S., Canada, Asia, and Europe. The Network also coordinates the monthly column, "Fathers' Voices" in *Exceptional Parent.*

2. Curriculum Development for Service Providers — NFN provides curricula and training assistance to health care agencies to help make services more father-friendly. May finds that most service providers realize that fathers are the "missing component" in service delivery to children who are disabled or chronically ill, but they need help to get fathers involved. NFN developed two monographs and a videotape that it sells to service providers:

    - *Fathers of Children with Special Needs: New Horizons*
    - *Circles of Care and Understanding: Support Programs for Fathers of Children with Special Needs*
    - "Special Dads, Special Kids: Fathers of Children with Disabilities" (23 minute video)

3. Outreach to Underserved Fathers — NFN's most recent initiatives have been targeted toward fathers in rural and inner-city communities and to fathers of children with HIV infection. Projects associated with these efforts include:

    - A forthcoming video investigating barriers to including African-American fathers in the health care of their special needs children (Fall 1995).
    - HIV Family Support and Leadership — This program seeks to reduce the sense of isolation and enhance social, emotional, and service delivery systems for fathers and families caring for children with HIV infection. Fathers of HIV-infected children face vilification from providers and the community, according to May, because their children's infection is often a result of their behavior. In Los Angeles, NFN helped organize a community-based network of Hispanic fathers of HIV-infected children — many of whom are single parents because the mothers have died of AIDS.

In the early days of the Network, most of the fathers came from intact families and 70% were fathers of children with Down's Syndrome, according to May. Today, the NFN's demographic is much more diverse with many divorced, separated, and younger unwed fathers, as well as a few grandfathers.

Contact: James May, MA, MEd, Director, (206) 747-4004. The monographs are available from the Association for the Care of Children's Health, 7910 Woodmont Avenue, Suite 300, Bethesda, MD 20814, (301) 654-6549.

Programs for Troubled and Vulnerable Families

(Sources: Hara & Ooms, 1994; Ooms & Binder,1992; Snyder & Ooms, 1991)

The question of how and whether fathers are involved in publicly funded programs in child welfare, child and adult mental health and substance abuse treatment, and juvenile justice programs has not been studied and is beyond the scope of this report. Typically, families needing services from these systems experience multiple relationship, psychological, and behavioral problems; many are at risk of having a child or adult placed outside the home. Moreover, since so many of them are poor, their difficulties are compounded by a lack of resources. In some of these families, physical violence, substance abuse, and serious couple conflict are also major issues.

The Family Impact Seminar, among other organizations, has reported on promising new service and treatment strategies and approaches to working with these families. These new service strategies are holistic, comprehensive, prevention-oriented, and designed to keep families together and improve their functioning. One of their core tenets is the commitment to "work with the whole family," which includes, in theory, the fathers and/or male partners and the extended family.

Family-centered programs most likely to involve fathers are those subscribing to family systems theory and practice, which assumes that the behavior, attitudes, and functioning of fathers and other men connected with families are critical to the well-being of the children, the mothers, and, indeed, the whole family. Similarly, the children and the mothers can greatly affect the behavior and well-being of the fathers. It is usually not possible to help these highly troubled families effectively unless the fathers or other significant men are involved in the services or treatment.

New program models and curricula that demonstrate system approaches to working with fathers and other members of the family system certainly exist in each of these program areas (see Snyder & Ooms, 1991). Other programs are beginning to involve fathers in specific situations. For example, Southwest Key, a program for delinquent youth and their families in Texas and Arizona, has added a "father component" that helps young men referred to their program reconnect with their fathers.

In spite of this widespread new commitment to the philosophy of working with the "whole family," it is our impression that, for the most part, front-line service providers in child welfare, mental health, substance abuse, and juvenile justice programs continue to focus mostly on the mothers. They do not have the training, skills, or time to be able to work effectively with the fathers, whether in the household or not, or with other members of the family system. In addition, program administrators have not systematically designed program and policy to facilitate and support a strong focus on working with the fathers.

Douglas Nelson, in the introduction to the recent *Kids Count Data Book*, said it best: "Our customary practice of treating fathers as marginal actors (in families) only serves to leave their problems largely unaddressed and their potential contribution to strengthening families largely untapped" (1994: 9).

Father Involvement in Schools

(Sources: Henderson, Marburger, & Ooms, 1986; Ooms and Hara, 1991; Schimmel & Fischer, 1977; Skaff, 1995; U.S. Department of Education, 1994)

There is a widespread consensus among educational leaders, supported by many studies, that parent involvement is a critical factor in children's success in school. Parent involvement is a short-hand term for a variety of ways in which parents need to be actively engaged in their own children's education, in order to support and reinforce their child's successful academic achievement and social behavior.

However, parent involvement in schools has usually meant mother involvement. Mothers are more likely to serve on PTA boards, volunteer in the classroom, accompany classes on field trips, organize fundraising, attend parent/teacher conferences, and be in regular contact with their children's teachers. Of course, schools welcome the participation of fathers in their programming, but few mount dad-centered recruitment efforts. The large body of research on the relationship of families and schools and the publications reporting on innovative parent involvement practices make scant reference to father involvement. However, one issue clearly gives educators considerable anxiety: how to communicate with divorced or separated parents who both want to be involved with their child's school, but who strongly disagree about their child's education and behavior.

Education Secretary Riley's National Education Goals 2000 includes as goal number eight: "Every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional, and academic growth of children." To implement this goal, the Department of Education is collaborating with the National Coalition for Parent Involvement in Education and other organizations in the Family Involvement Partnership for Learning, a grassroots movement to promote and support family involvement in learning. However, there is, as yet, no special focus on fathers in this Partnership. Nor do any national father involvement initiatives in education exist.

"Schools take whatever parents they can get," notes Anne Henderson of the Center for Law and Education. But due to a combination of lack of resources and continuing cultural

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

beliefs that parent involvement is "women's work," only a few school-based parent involvement initiatives focus on fathers. Individual schools, however, have had some success with father/son breakfasts and mentoring programs, as well as using fathers as coaches for school sports.

For non-custodial fathers, the story is bleaker. While non-custodial parents have legal rights to their children's records, few schools keep non-custodial parents informed of school activities or even of their children's performance, according to Henderson. "Schools don't like to be caught in the middle" of non-married parents, she noted. The National Committee for Citizens in Education recommended that schools make notification of non-custodial fathers routine unless custodial mothers offer an objection, but few schools have adopted this practice.

John Guidubaldi, PhD, a school psychologist and researcher in Ohio who is a member of the National Commission on Family and Children's Welfare, recently argued before the Commission that the education establishment needs to focus on what schools can do to promote and reinforce fathers' contact with schools. Teachers and administrators need to be trained in why and how to involve fathers or father surrogates. And schools should routinely send all school information and reports to non-custodial fathers, he asserted.

Dads' Club at Rancho Middle School, in Milpitas, CA, is one example of a successful father involvement initiative. The Dads' Club, which meets one evening a month, describes itself as a combination of "boosters, group counseling, sharing group, project/school service cadre, and the ultimate 'child support team.'" They average 25-45 men at each meeting, with additional men involved in project work. Joseph Skaff, Milpitas assistant principal, offers these hints for organizing a successful Dad's Club:

- designate a teacher or administrator as the school's liaison to the Dad's Club;
- make personal outreach contacts to the fathers, with timely follow-up;
- utilize the skills and interests of your men;
- invite fathers to speak at school functions;
- develop phone trees;
- highlight Dads' Club activities in the school newsletter;
- if your community includes immigrant families, translate all announcements and meeting minutes into the languages the fathers speak; and
- encourage the fathers to develop tangible projects so that they can see results.

Contact: Joseph Skaff, assistant principal, Rancho Middle School, Milpitas, CA, (408) 445-9930.

Balancing Work and Fatherhood

(Sources: Brott, 1995; Horn, 1995; Lamb & Sagi, 1983; Levine & Hernandez, 1992; Levine, 1994; Levine, 1995; Lubin, 1995; National Center for Fathering, 1995; O'Connell, 1993; Women's Legal Defense Fund, 1994)

Although workplace policies are generally the province of the private sector, policymakers can affect them through legislation and regulation. For instance, the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 requires federal, state, and local governments and private employers with more than 50 employees to offer 12 weeks of unpaid leave to employees for family or medical reasons.

Besides legislation, federal and state governments, as the nation's largest employers, can provide national leadership by example through instituting family- and father-friendly work

policies, like the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department (see below). The federal government has been a pioneer in offering flex-time, part-time, and compressed work schedules to its employees. The Department of Labor's Women's Bureau has been at the forefront in encouraging family-friendly policies and administers an information clearinghouse on work and families. With or without government intervention, however, employers are learning that employees perform better when their work and family lives are balanced.

In recent years, the business community has become more sensitive to employees' needs to balance work and family life. On-site child care, tele-commuting, flex-time, job-sharing, and other family friendly policies and programs are becoming more prevalent, particularly in white-collar work environments.

In several recent polls, working fathers have indicated their dissatisfaction with the balance of work and family life — a condition James Levine has termed "Daddy Stress." Thirty percent of fathers in a *Fortune* magazine survey said they had turned down a job promotion or transfer because it would have reduced the time they spent with their families. Seventy-five percent of men surveyed by the *Dallas Morning News* said they would trade rapid career advancement for the chance to leave more time open for their families (National Center for Fathering, 1995).

However, fathers do not always take advantage of these benefits, nor are they usually encouraged to do so. Even in Sweden, where generous parental leave policies are the norm, only a minority of eligible fathers take advantage of them. When 1,500 American CEOs and human resource directors of Fortune 500 companies were asked how much paternity leave they felt was appropriate, 63% said, "none." Even when employers make new family-friendly benefits available to fathers, that may not mean men will become more active in the care of their children. Donna Lambeth, executive director of the Work/Family Resource Center, a child care resource and referral service which contracts with some of the largest employers in the Winston-Salem, NC, area, notes that only 3% of their phone inquiries come from fathers — and she added that those men usually call because they believe the covered employee must make the initial contact.

And the modest rise in the number of fathers who will publicly admit to putting family before work has created a backlash, particularly among single co-workers, according to a recent *Wall Street Journal* article (June 13, 1995). The article cites a recent survey of 14,000 workers by Hewitt Associates that found that one in five employees say they have been asked to take on extra work to fill gaps created by co-workers' family responsibilities.

Despite this mixed bag of indicators, James Levine has identified a number of family-friendly corporations that offer innovative packages of benefits to fathers. Among the most interesting are:

- **Apple Computer, Inc., Cupertino, CA** — Apple's menu of family services includes an on-site child care center for infants to six-year-olds at corporate headquarters, child care resources and referral services for its 14,000 employees nationwide, adoption assistance, help selecting and working with school systems, and lunchtime seminars on work and family issues. The birth or adoption of a child brings an employee an automatic $500 baby bonus and the right to 16 weeks of unpaid leave with health benefits and job security.

- **Eastman Kodak, Rochester, NY** — Kodak has several innovative services, including a vacation camp when school is not in session, counseling on education

issues, and work and family life seminars at lunchtime, which draw audiences that are 50 percent male.

- **Los Angeles Department of Water and Power** — LADWP is the only company in the country with an explicit and comprehensive Fathering Program. The department's 11,000 employees — 80 percent of them male — have access to services to support them from impending fatherhood through the childrearing years, including four months of unpaid leave for birth or adoption, LADWP-affiliated child care programs, lunchtime seminars for expectant fathers, "Tips for Dads" information hotline, and peer support groups.

- **Peabody & Arnold, Boston** — The father-friendly attitude of this law firm is reflected in its expectation for billable hours — 1,800 hours per year rather than the 2,100-plus of other large firms. A partner launched a series of parenting seminars, entitled "Families First."

- **Sacramento County Sheriff's Department, CA** — In 1990, Sacramento become the first county in California to offer paid parental leave to its employees. Between 1990 and 1992, members of the 1,700-person Sheriff's Department were its most frequent users, with slightly more than half of the 52 leaves taken by men. Under county policy, employees with at least one year of continuous employment are eligible for 160 hours of parental leave over four months.

Lessons Learned

(Sources: Fagan, 1995; Fagan & Stevenson, 1995; Levine, Murphy, & Wilson, 1995; Sander, 1993)

The initiatives and demonstration programs described here offer new directions and strategies for use on a wider scale across many publicly funded family and child service systems. But because they are so new and generally underfunded, there have been very few evaluations of these programs — and none at all that have employed experimental or comparison groups, which would permit us to document the effects of father involvement on the children, the fathers themselves, and the family as a whole.

Nevertheless, program administrators and staff have learned many lessons about policies and practices they believe contribute to successful father involvement programs. First, to succeed, program administrators and staff from the top on down must have a strong commitment to working with fathers. Second, most programs have found it essential to designate at least one staff member who takes special responsibility for conducting outreach activities to fathers. Third, it is very helpful to have men on staff if you want fathers to feel comfortable and at ease. In addition, the following tips emerge from the fatherhood program literature:

- Create a father-friendly environment: *expect* fathers to be involved in the program, display positive images of men, put magazines of interest to men in the waiting room, and feature men in the newsletter.
- Recognize and confront the hidden resistance from staff and mothers to include fathers.
- Recognize and confront the hidden fears of men to participate.
- Make sure that intake forms give mothers opportunities to list "significant" males in their or their children's lives.
- Actively recruit men — in both formal and informal ways.

- Find out what the men involved in the program want.
- Include both custodial and non-custodial parents on mailing lists for all forms of notification about their children.
- Offer men opportunities to become involved in activities that may lead to employment possibilities.
- Enlist the active participation of fathers in program development and implementation. Put men on a parents advisory council.
- If targeting a minority or disadvantaged population of fathers, confront issues of racism and classism.
- Plan father-child or fathers-only events.
- Train facilitators of fathers support groups to be effective discussion leaders.

PART V: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Our review of fatherhood initiatives has been necessarily incomplete. We have chosen to highlight particularly innovative projects in a few program areas rather than attempt a comprehensive review. We realize also that a policy focus on fathers is new and has not yet penetrated many communities and sectors of society:

- The majority of the service programs identified here serve fathers in inner-city, African-American communities. Although we have reported on a handful of programs targeting Latino fathers, in general there appears to be a dearth of fatherhood programs designed for Latinos, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and other minority populations. In addition, there is little mention in the fatherhood literature of programs serving white, rural, and suburban populations.

- We have reported on fatherhood initiatives in a selected number of federal program domains. But there are several other federal agencies and programs we have not reviewed that certainly have the potential for instituting a focus on fathers — and may indeed have begun to do so — including federal housing assistance programs, prisons, and food and nutrition programs. Nor, as we've noted, have we examined father involvement in child welfare, mental health, juvenile justice, and substance abuse programs.

This report has conducted a broad review of emerging program and policy strategies that promote responsible fathering and strengthen the relationship of fathers to their children — especially for those fathers absent from the household because of divorce, separation, or non-marriage. We believe it provides ample evidence that there is indeed a groundswell of activity to include fathers. To some, this new focus on fatherhood may seem merely the latest in a series of social policy fads — much buzz followed by a quick fade. We disagree. A sustained policy interest in responsible fatherhood — in its fullest definition — reflects the natural evolution of a true family perspective in public programs that for too long have used "family" to mean solely mothers and children.

Although much of the initiative and leadership in the new fatherhood movement is centered in the private, non-profit sector, policymakers can and should play a much more active role than they have to date. This report has identified a wide range of policy strategies and tools that federal and state governments can use to promote responsible fathering behavior, including:

- Funding demonstrations of new approaches to providing services for fathers and involving fathers in existing service programs.

- Removing financial and administrative barriers and disincentives to promoting responsible fatherhood in government programs.

- Setting positive goals and expectations for responsible behavior through requirements in the law and regulations and through administrative guidelines.

- Providing states and communities with financial incentives as well as direct funding for promoting fatherhood activities.

- Requiring, promoting, and funding data collection and research on fathers, and evaluation of new father-focused demonstrations.

- Developing innovative inservice training curricula for program staff, incorporating them into the various training and technical assistance programs funded by federal and state governments.

The fatherhood field will be enriched by the increased networking and sharing of information and lessons learned that is already underway. However, as the new fatherhood programs and initiatives develop and grow in number, they will need to address several overarching challenges and questions:

Financing
The lack of available funding is always a critical issue when new needs are identified and new programs and services proposed. Thus, there is likely to be resistance to opening up public programs to a new client group of low-income, non-custodial fathers when resources are already tight. These men are among the least served of all populations, as the Paternal Involvement Demonstration Project in Chicago learned when they found that their participants had no access to health care and their untreated health problems prevented them from participating in the job training and employment activities (Pate, 1995).

- What sources of funding can sustain community-based fatherhood programs and related services beyond the demonstration stage? What monies can be tapped to support replication of successful strategies in other communities?

- In an era of severe budget cuts and anticipated reductions in services, how realistic is it to expect that existing government-sponsored family service programs can expand to include a focus on father involvement and perhaps provide new services for fathers?

Father Focus as Standard Frontline Practice
Many opportunities currently exist in Head Start, education, maternal and child health and other programs to reorient current services to include fathers in their family focus. However, the critical players to engage in this effort are the front-line staff.

- What are the best strategies and incentives to use to help front-line service providers work with fathers as a matter of course when delivering services to children?

- How should line staff be trained to work with fathers more effectively?

Data, Research, and Program Evaluation
Sound information is needed to build a strong rationale for a focus on fathers, to demonstrate that providing new preventive services to fathers is cost-effective, and to design more effective program approaches. Program and survey data on fathers, especially non-custodial fathers, is extremely scarce, and research on fatherhood, while growing, is in its infancy. Our next seminar will focus on the status of data, research, and program evaluation on fathers and promoting responsible fatherhood, and identify the questions needing further research.

Relationship with Mothers
Our next seminar will also explore issues related to the relationships between custodial and non-custodial parents, including an exploration of the following questions:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- What program strategies should fatherhood programs use to obtain the cooperation and support of mothers in promoting responsible fatherhood?
- What policy stance should the emerging national fatherhood organizations adopt towards the needs and rights of mothers, especially custodial, low-income mothers?
- How can we avoid thinking of resources devoted to helping fathers as competing with resources for mothers?

PART VI: RESOURCES AND REFERENCES

Electronic Resources

FatherNet
FatherNet is an electronic information service, operated by the University of Minnesota's Children, Youth, and Family Consortium as part of the Consortium Electronic Clearinghouse (CEC). FatherNet compiles information on the involvement of men in the lives of children, including research, opinion, and policy documents. FatherNet includes a bulletin board, through which more than 150 fathers from around the country and the world discuss subjects like disciplining children and attention deficit disorder. FatherNet began in 1994 in connection with Vice President Gore's Family Reunion III: The Role of Men in Children's Lives. FatherNet is a free service and may be accessed through the Internet.

For more information about FatherNet, call the Consortium at (612) 626-1212 or e-mail them at cyfcec@maroon.tc.umn.edu.

Video Resources

"Show Your Love"
"Show Your Love," a 20-minute videotape produced for Family Reunion III: The Role of Men in Children's Lives in July 1994, depicts the importance of custodial and non-custodial fathers being involved with their children through interviews with children themselves. It may be purchased for $80.

Contact: Boston University, College of Communications, 640 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215, (617) 353-3483.

National, State and Local Fatherhood Organizations

(adapted, in part, with permission from Levine, Murphy, & Wilson, 1993; and the National Center for Fathering, 1995)

African-American Fathers Program
This North Minneapolis program promotes school readiness for children, aged 0 to 6, by bringing African-American men back into the family system as strong leaders, caretakers and role models. After a pilot project last year, the program will now expand to serve 100 men a year. Its services will include classes in child development, support groups, child care, and help for men in finding the resources to prepare for or secure employment.

Contact: Steven Brown, Director, 1120 Oliver Ave. N., Minneapolis, MN 55411, (612) 588-8893.

Baltimore City Healthy Start Men's Services
The goal of this program is to assist inner-city fathers and other men in support roles in maintaining involvement with their children and families. Men who take part must be associated with a woman with an infant child or a pregnant woman enrolled in Healthy Start, a federally funded program that seeks to reduce infant mortality. Because the staff

works with the men during the prenatal and early stages of a child's life, the men gain the skills to encourage their children's development. Counseling and case work also help the men support their children financially. The program served 60 men during its first year, but plans expanded activities to serve 200 men.

Director: Joseph Jones, Director, 600 N. Carey, Baltimore, MD 21217, (410) 728-7470.

Cardinal Spellman Head Start Center
Cardinal Spellman Head Start serves Manhattan's Lower East Side, which has a history of providing a first home for many immigrant groups coming to this country. Many of these children come from homes where English is not spoken as a first language. What started out as an annual Father's Day event has expanded into a drive to recruit and involve men on a daily basis. The wide diversity of ethnic and religious cultures of the families served is an asset at Cardinal Spellman. The center staff and parent group often use the father's culture as a way to involve males, i.e., Chinese and Bengali men, proud of their heritage of fine food, might be asked to prepare food for a Head Start function. The center staff has an unwritten rule: Find out what the fathers are proud of, and use it to get them involved.

Contact: Joanne Milano, Director, 137 East Second Street, New York, NY 10009, (212) 677-7766.

Concerned Black Men, Inc.
Concerned Black Men is a national nonprofit organization with affiliate chapter in at least eight cities. Male volunteers provide positive role models to young men and build stronger channels of communication between adults and children through programs and activities promoting educational, cultural, and social development. The Washington, DC, chapter, for example, conducts an annual youth recognition awards banquet, a Martin Luther King, Jr., Oratory Contest, teen pregnancy prevention workshops, and a youth offender outreach project, among other programs.

Contact: Concerned Black Men, Inc., Washington, DC, chapter, 1511 K Street, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20005, (202) 783-5414.

DADS Teen Father Program
The DADS Teen Father Program, a collaboration between the County of San Diego, the San Diego Consortium & Private Industry Council, and San Diego Unified School District, is the only program in Southern California providing comprehensive services to teen fathers. Established in 1993, the program works with young fathers, ages 14 to 21, to increase their parenting skills, reduce the risk of unplanned pregnancies, and assist them in preparing for careers, thus enabling them to be financially responsible for their children. Teen dads also receive such support services as child care, paternity establishment, transportation, health examinations, clothing, and certification fees. Each class of about 30 young men receives 120 hours of training, in addition to many more hours of informal support from peers and staff.

Contact: Dadisi R. Elliott, Director, County of San Diego, Department of Social Services, 7065 Broadway, Suite 200, Lemon Grove, CA 91945, (619) 668-3940.

Early Childhood Family Education Program
As part of the Center's Early Childhood Family Education Programs, 95% of the Minnesota Public School Districts offer Super Saturday programs aimed primarily at white, middle-class fathers, some single fathers, court-referred fathers, and fathers of children with disabilities. This state-funded program serves 40-60 families a year and has worked with 400-500 men and their children over ten years. The primary service is parent education and support for fathers, including a parent-child activity component, offered two Saturdays each month from October through May. Goals of the sessions are (l) to provide safe, fun activities for dads and kids to do together, (2) to allow fathers of young children to meet and talk informally with other men about the joys and challenges of being a father, (3) to involve fathers in different types of activities and to stimulate ideas for activities to do at home, and (4) to provide fathers with information about child behavior and development during the preschool years.

Contact: Glen Palm, Center for Child and Family Studies, St. Cloud State University, 626 6th Avenue, N., St. Cloud, MN 56303, (612) 255-2129.

The Fatherhood Project
National Practitioners Network for Fathers and Families
The Fatherhood Project is a national research and education project examining the future of fatherhood and ways to support men's involvement in childrearing. It was founded in 1981 at the Bank Street College of Education and relocated by James Levine, its director, to the Families and Work Institute in 1989.

Also located at the Institute, the National Practitioners Network was established in 1994 by 30 representatives of programs focused on fathers and families. Under the direction of Ed Pitt, Associate Director of The Fatherhood Project, the Network supports and provides a collective voice to the myriad of community-based programs and organizations that are working to engage, re-engage, and increase the involvement of fathers in the lives of their children. Most of these programs operate in isolation and are limited in scale and scope; the Practitioners Network acts as the vehicle to promote their work, assist in the development of new programs, provide an appropriate context for experience-sharing among programs, identify program and policy related issues, uncover new research issues derived from practice, and increase the opportunity for practitioners to communicate, cooperate, and collaborate.

Contact: James Levine, EdD, Director, and Ed Pitt, MSW, Associate Director, Families and Work Institute, 330 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10001, (212) 268-4846.

Father Policy Institute/Family Resource Coalition
The Father Policy Institute was founded in 1995 to examine the legal and social support systems available to never married, low-skilled, low-income men who wish to remain active, contributing members of their families. In particular, the Institute seeks to determine whether these systems assist fathers in adhering to federal and state regulations in establishing paternity, making child support payments, and working with other family policies. The Institute also provides public education to increase awareness about the barriers that these fathers face in becoming responsible fathers and to encourage the development of programs that will help them achieve that goal.

The FPI is part of the Family Resource Coalition (FRC), which represents some 2,500 family resource programs in the United States and Canada. FRC has been a national leader in supporting the development of new resources in local communities through program-

level technical assistance and federal policy advocacy. FRC builds support and resources within communities to empower families and to foster optimal development for children.

Contacts: Kirk E. Harris, JD, PhD, Institute Director, and David Pate, AM, Lead Consultant, 200 South Michigan Avenue, 16th Floor, Chicago, Illinois 60603, (312) 341-0900.

Fathers' Resource Center
The mission of the Fathers' Resource Center is to provide men with the inner resources to be the kind of fathers whom their children need. Services include father support groups, parenting classes, a family law clinic, educational workshops, and a speaker's bureau. In keeping with its anti-violence perspective, the Center also offers programs on dealing with anger and on understanding abuse. Since its founding in 1991, the Resource Center has expanded to five offices.

Contact: Neil Tift, Director, 430 Oak Grove Street, Suite 105, Minneapolis, MN 55403, (612) 874-1509.

Father Resource Program
The Father Resource Program seeks to improve the life options of expectant or parenting fathers, who are unemployed, underemployed, and undereducated. The program specifically targets African-American men, 18 to 25 years old. The program recognizes that young parents who are provided with strong social support, adequate resources, and employment options will be able to achieve that which they most want to be: caring, involved, good parents. Young fathers who volunteer to participate in the program receive training and support in a variety of areas, including job placement, fatherhood/manhood development education, job readiness skills, peer group support, legal assistance, and GED instruction on site.

Contact: Wallace McLaughlin, PhD, Wishard Memorial Hospital, 1001 W. 10th Street, Myers Building, Indianapolis, IN 46202, (317) 630-2486.

FUTURES Connection
Currently serving 140 men and women, this office in Kansas City is part of the Futures umbrella, a federal- and state-funded program designed for non-custodial parents who have *not* been referred to the courts for enforcement of child support orders or establishment of paternity. The program offers peer support to help fathers focus more clearly on their feelings for their children. It includes a responsible fatherhood component that examines topics ranging from developing values in children to dealing with conflict, anger, and self-esteem. The program also offers adult basic education, vocational training, on-the-job training, and job placement assistance.

Contact: Darryl Bush, Director, 615 E. 13th Street, Kansas City, MO 64106, (816) 889-3152.

The Institute for Responsible Fatherhood and Family Revitalization
The Institute is a nonprofit, non-traditional, community-based organization, designed to create an environment where young fathers can make life safe for themselves, their children, and the mothers of their children. Established in 1982, the Institute has served over 2,000 fathers and their families. The goal is to help young men become responsible,

nurturing, resourceful fathers. The fathers are given positive images, relevant visions, and the support necessary for them to assimilate these images and visions into their daily lives through one-on-one counseling and crisis management. In addition, the Institute offers a weekly father support group and mother support group, group counseling in detention homes, and Saturday visitation to the detention home. The program takes a holistic approach to family dynamics by offering services to both mothers and grandparents. The Institute hopes to address proactively the challenge the family unit increasingly faces by helping other metropolitan areas learn and use these strategies.

The Institute seeks to turn the hearts of fathers to their children and to turn the hearts of children to their fathers. The Institute asks participants to accept the challenge of a *risk-free* lifestyle — a life free of tobacco, alcohol, other drugs, abusive behavior, sex outside of marriage, obesity, and other high-risk tendencies that plague communities. The fathers receive intense, non-traditional, one-on-one support, group support, family outreach, fathering skills, health and nutrition information, medical and housing referrals, and educational and career guidance. A special component of The Institute's work is its outreach to incarcerated fathers, which seeks to improve the relationship between these fathers and their children and to deal with their eventual homecoming or permanent confinement. Established in 1978, the Institute is currently expanding its outreach by launching new programs in Nashville, Yonkers, NY, Milwaukee, San Diego, and Washington, D.C.

Contact: Charles Ballard, President, 1090 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20005-4961, (202) 789-6376.

Male Involvement Project/St. Bernadine's Head Start & Adult Learning Center

For the past five years, this program has worked with the Male Involvement Project, based at the Family and Work Institute in New York, to focus on increasing male participation in the childrearing and education process. The goal is to help African-American males become positive role models with the ability to nurture their children. The Project supports men in receiving needed services such as literacy classes, job training, mental health services, and continuing education. The program has served over 700 families.

Contact: James Worthy, Director, 3814 Edmondson Avenue, Baltimore, MD 21229, (410) 233-4500.

MELD for Young Dads

Started in 1987, the MELD for Young Dads program has grown into a national parenting information and support program that addresses the needs of young fathers. With affiliates in Cedar Rapids, Davenport, and Des Moines, Iowa; Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minnesota; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Rockford and Chicago, Illinois; and Grand Junction, Colorado, the program reaches out to both custodial and non-custodial fathers, typically between 15 and 25 years old. MELD for Young Dads aims to prevent paternal neglect by helping young fathers handle the societal and interpersonal problems that can be barriers to involvement with their children. Through individualized service and group meetings, the program helps young fathers learn the skills for problem-solving, decisionmaking, and competent parenting.

Contact: Dwaine R. Simms, 123 North Third Street, Suite 507, Minneapolis, MN 55401, (612) 332-7563.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Men in Child Care
2430 31st Avenue (South)
Minneapolis, MN 55406
(612) 724-3430

Contact: Bryan Nelson

The Men's Group of the Fairfax-San Anselmo Children's Center
Founded in 1981, the Men's Group at the Children's Center brings together fathers and children for monthly breakfasts and other activities. As part of a child care center, the program encourages fathers' involvement in their children's education. Through the Bay Area Male Involvement Network, the Men's Group is working with six additional child care centers as they develop groups for fathers. The Network now serves approximately 700 men.

Contact: Stanley Seiderman, 199 Porteous Avenue, Fairfax, CA 94930, (415) 454-1811.

Men's Issues Think Tank
4839 305th Avenue, NE
Cambridge, MN 55508
(612) 689-5885

Contact: Lowell Johnson

Minnesota Parents' Fair Share
The Minnesota Parents' Fair Share (MPFS) Program serves non-custodial parents, usually fathers, who are unemployed or underemployed and who are behind in court-ordered child support payments to a custodial parent who receives AFDC. A total of 519 participants received program services from January of 1989 to December of 1993. The program is currently operated by Anoka County Jobs and Training and Dakota County Employment Training Center. MPFS combines employment and training services with enhanced child support enforcement, peer support, parenting education, and mediation services. Its goals are to improve the employment and educational opportunities of non-custodial parents, to increase child support payments and health insurance coverage provided by non-custodial parents to children living in poverty, to enhance their parenting and life skills, and to gain the support of the larger community.

Contact: David Parrish, 33 East Wentworth Avenue, West St. Paul, MN 55118, (612) 450-2676.

National Center for Family-Centered Care
7910 Woodmont Avenue, Suite 300
Bethesda, MD 20814
(301) 654-6549

National Center on Fathering
The National Center on Fathering is a leading research center that develops resources to strengthen community-based efforts addressing the need for more and better fathering. As

a result of its research, the Center has also developed training programs for fathers from diverse cultural communities. It encourages and supports specialized fathering groups for divorced fathers, stepfathers, military fathers, and incarcerated fathers. The Center has designed programs to equip fathers in civic, corporate, and ecclesiastical settings.

The Center is committed to strengthening families and society by strengthening fathers. The Center initiates relationships with as many fathers as possible and then provides additional resources to add progressively to their commitment and skills as fathers. The Center relies on broad-reaching media to raise men's awareness about the importance of fathering, but its key strategy remains the seminar or small group experience with other fathers. Thus, there is a heavy reliance on local coordination and implementation.

The National Center for Fathering offers two-day seminars to teach men to be better fathers, as well as other public education efforts through radio broadcasts, the magazine *Today's Father*, videos, and public speaking engagements.

Contact: Ken Canfield, PhD, President, 10200 W. 75th Street, Suite 267, Shawnee Mission, KS 66204, (913) 384-4661.

National Center on Fathers and Families

The National Center on Fathers and Families (NCOFF) seeks to improve the life chances of children and the strength of families by facilitating the effective involvement of fathers. Through research and support for effective policies and programs, NCOFF aims to increase and enrich the possibilities for children and to help government agencies, employers, and all segments of society encourage the participation of fathers in their children's lives. NCOFF was developed in the spirit of the Philadelphia Children's Network (PCN) motto, "Help the children, fix the system." Like PCN, NCOFF believes that children need loving, nurturing families, that families need to be supported in providing nurturance, and that family support efforts should increase the ability of *both* parents and other adults within and outside the biological family to contribute to a child's development.

Founded in 1994 with core funding from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, NCOFF develops and implements a practice-focused, practice-derived research agenda to expand the knowledge base on father involvement and family development.

Contact: Vivian Gadsden, PhD, Director, University of Pennsylvania, Graduate School of Education, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 686-3910.

National Fatherhood Initiative (NFI)

The National Fatherhood Initiative defines its primary objective as saturating national awareness with messages that advocate responsible fatherhood. NFI seeks to define the dimensions of the father-absence crisis for the cultural agenda, to reshape the way America thinks about the issue, and to implement strategies for a restoration of responsible fatherhood.

The NFI aims to create an historic social movement around fatherhood with the help of PSAs and national media campaigns, national and regional fatherhood summits, and the development of state and local fatherhood projects or campaigns.

Contact: Wade Horn, PhD, Director, 600 Eden Road, Building E, Lancaster PA 17601, (717) 581-8860.

Parenting Opportunities Program (POP)
The Parenting Opportunities Program (POP) helps fathers obtain their GED and/or high school diplomas, receive vocational training, become fully employed, and develop parenting and relationship skills. POP seeks to provide services that will enhance the quality of health, education, and economic well-being of the disadvantaged.

Contact: Peggy Stovall, Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission (FCEOC), Employment and Training Division, 1900 Mariposa Mall, Suite 303, Fresno, CA 93721, (209) 263-1191.

Parents' Fair Share, Grand Rapids
Operating through the Kent County Friend of the Court, Parents' Fair Share serves unemployed, non-custodial parents who have an obligation to pay child support. Eligibility criteria for the project include being a non-custodial parent of a child who receives AFDC, owing an AFDC or Medicaid arrearage within Michigan, having one or more Child Support Enforcement cases within Kent County, being behind schedule in paying court-ordered child support, being unemployed or underemployed, and living within commuting distance of the Parents' Fair Share Site. The Friend of the Court helps these parents find job training and employment opportunities and is able to suspend existing child support obligations while participants are involved in training or seeking employment. Additional services of the project include counseling and peer support, self-esteem building, and mediation.

Contact: William Camden, Friend of the Court, 50 Monroe, NW, Suite 260, Grand Rapids, MI 49503, (616) 336-2800.

Parents' Fair Share (PFS), St. Louis
A national demonstration program designed by Manpower Development Research Corporation, Parents' Fair Share provides employment, training, and other services to unemployed or underemployed non-custodial parents of children receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). The St. Louis program is unique as a cooperative effort between two state agencies, the FUTURES Program and the Division of Child Support Enforcement.

Director: Donald Holt, Director, 4411 North Nestead, St. Louis, MO 63115, (314) 877-2153.

Parents' Fair Share in New Jersey
As a participant in Parents' Fair Share, this program serves non-custodial fathers whose children receive AFDC. The program seeks to enhance the economic responsibility and family involvement of non-custodial fathers, 16 to 45 years old, whose children are on welfare. Its five components are peer support, case management, employment and training, mediation and enhanced child support.

Contact: Barbara Kelley-Sease, Union Industrial Home for Children, Operation Fatherhood, 864 Bellevue Avenue, Trenton, NJ 08618, (809) 695-1492.

Parents in Community Action (PICA) Head Start
A private, nonprofit agency originally founded to administer the Head Start program in Hennepin County, Minnesota, PICA offers a variety of child- and family-development programs for more than 2,000 low-income children and their families. PICA's Men Are Important program focuses on low-income adult males who have contact with children enrolled in PICA's Head Start program, with the ultimate goal of encouraging these men to become active, positive role models for children and for other males in the community. Headed by PICA's Male Involvement Specialist, the Men Are Important program offers a variety of events, training opportunities, and discussions designed specifically to foster the involvement of males in the lives of low-income children and families and to increase positive male involvement in Head Start, in other PICA programs, and in the community. PICA is recognized as a national model for its success in the area of male involvement and is currently participating in a national training project to train other early childhood programs in strategies for increasing positive male involvement.

Contact: Alyce M. Dillon, Director, 700 Humboldt Avenue North, Minneapolis, MN 55411, (612) 425-7422 or (612) 377-7422.

The Paternal Involvement Demonstration Project (PIDP)
This project works with 130 non-custodial fathers (primarily African-American) who want to become more involved with their children, all of whom receive AFDC. Over the past three years, PIDP has increased job preparation, job development, and job placement services for the participants in three sites: Chicago Commons' Mary McDowell Settlement, Kennedy King College (a community college), and the Chicago Institute for Economic Development. All participants must declare paternity, provide child support, and work with the mothers of their children. With support from an unusual collaboration of public and private funders, the program also includes an independent evaluation and a group that advocates for public policies that encourage fathers' involvement with their children.

Contact: Hector Fernandez, 332 South Michigan Avenue, Suite 500, Chicago, IL 60604, (312) 427-4830.

Penrose Family Service
Through a collaboration of social service agencies, this community-based center provides integrated human services for the north St. Louis City area. When an individual enters the center, he or she is met by a family focus worker who assesses the types of services needed. As a Parents' Fair Share site, the center offers employment training and education programs to low-income men, as well as primary health care, child support services, court supervision services, and other services. The center operates as an integrated, seamless service provider.

Contact: Donell Whitfield, Missouri Department of Social Services, 4411 N. Newstead Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63115, (314) 877-2000.

Promise Keepers
Created by Ex-University of Colorado football coach Bill McCartney in 1990, Promise Keepers describes itself as "a Christ-centered ministry dedicated to uniting men through vital relationships to become godly influences in their world." The central focus of their efforts are one- and two-day Men's Conferences held in stadiums across the country, in which men are exhorted to rededicate themselves to their families. Thirteen such conferences are planned for 1995; most are sold out at $55 per participant. They are also

building a network through local churches. Promise Keepers grew from 22 full-time staff and a $4 million budget in 1993 to a staff of 150 and an annual budget of $22 million in 1994.

Contact: Steve Chavis, PO Box 18376, Boulder, CO 80308, (303) 421-2800.

The Responsive Fathers Program

The Responsive Fathers Program helps young men develop the skills to support their children developmentally and financially. From 1991 to 1993, the program was one of six sites in a national demonstration, developed by Public/Private Ventures, to enhance the capacity of young, unmarried fathers to become responsible and involved parents, wage-earners, and providers of child support. Today the program provides 45 young fathers with peer support, parenting skills, and support in advancing their education and employment. A case manager links young fathers to resources and services and helps them learn to negotiate the complexities of both social support systems and the work place. The Responsive Fathers Program also helps fathers and mothers learn to act as a team on behalf of their children, whether or not they remain involved as a couple. Over the coming months, the program will also begin an innovative literacy curriculum.

Contact: Thomas J. Henry, Philadelphia Children's Network, 1600 Arch Street, Fifth Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19102, (215) 686-3910.

Tennessee Parents' Fair Share

Part of the national Parents' Fair Share demonstration, this program assists non-custodial parents, usually fathers, of children receiving public assistance in finding work so that they can make regular child support payments and be a part of their children's lives. An unusual educational component in this Tennessee program gives men access to a computer lab at Shelby State Community College, where they can improve their basic skills at their own pace. Currently serving more than 60 men, the program also offers counseling, meditation, pre-employment training, and support services.

Contact: Viola J. O'Neil, The Dermon Building, 46 North Third Street, Suite 602, Memphis, TN 38103, (901) 522-8311.

References

Achatz, M., & MacAllum, C.A. *Young Unwed Fathers: Report from the Field.* Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures, Spring 1994.

Advisory Committee on Head Start Quality and Expansion. *Creating a 21st Century Head Start.* Final Report. Washington, DC: Author, 1994.

Allen, M., Brown, P. & Finlay, B. *Helping Children by Strengthening Families.* Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund, 1992.

Annie E. Casey Foundation. *Kids Count Data Book 1995: State Profiles of Child Well-Being.* Baltimore, MD: Author, 1995.

Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs. *Adolescent Fathers: Directory of Services.* Washington, DC: National Center for Education in Maternal and Child Health, 1991.

Aydt, K., Goodson, P., Serrins, D., Edmundson, E., & Evans, A. Evaluation of sex education curricula: Measuring up to the SIECUS Guidelines. *Journal of School Health, 64*(8), October, 1994.

Bartlett, K.H. Helping young men to be fathers. *Child Support Report,* 17(6), 3, June, 1995.

Besharov, D. Risk and realism: Teen sex. In J. Garrison, M. Smith, and D. Besharov, *Sex Education in the Schools* (pp. 61-74). Menlo Park, CA: Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, 1994.

Blankenhorn, D. *Fatherless America: Confronting Our Most Urgent Social Problem.* New York, NY: BasicBooks, 1995.

Bloom, D., & Sherwood, K. *Matching Opportunities to Obligations: Lessons for Child Support Enforcement Reform from the Parents' Fair Share Pilot Phase.* New York, NY: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, April 1994.

Bly, R. *Iron John.* New York: Addison-Wesley, 1990.

Bowman, J., & Associates. *Enhancing Male Involvement in Reproductive Health: A Review of Efforts By Family Planning Programs.* Austin, TX: Author, 1991.

Brott, A. *The Expectant Father: Facts, Tips, and Advice for Dads-To-Be.* Abbeville Press, 1995.

Brown, S., & Eisenberg, L. (Eds.). *The Best Intentions: Unintended Pregnancy and Well-Being of Children and Families.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1995.

Center for the Study of Social Policy & Philadelphia Children's Network. *World Without Work: Causes and Consequences of Black Male Joblessness.* Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Social Policy, 1994.

Clinton, W.J. *Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies on Supporting the Role of Fathers in Families*, June 16, 1995.

Coalition of Family Organizations (COFO). *Principles of Family-Centered Health Care: A Health Care Reform White Paper.* Washington, DC: Family Impact Seminar, Winter 1992.

Cohen, E., & Ooms, T. *Looking Ahead: The Promise of Head Start as a Comprehensive Family Support Program.* A Background Briefing Report. Washington, DC: Family Impact Seminar, 1994.

Council on Families in America. *Marriage in America: A Report to the Nation.* New York, NY: Institute for American Values, March, 1995.

Crowell, N.A., & Leeper, E.M. (Eds.). *American's Fathers and Public Policy: Report of a Workshop.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1994.

Danzinger, S.K., Kastner, C.K., & Nickel, T.J. The problems and promise of child support reform. In R. Lerman & T. Ooms, (eds.), *Young Unwed Fathers: Changing Roles and Emerging Policies.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1993.

Donovan, P. Family planning clinics: facing higher costs and sicker patients. *Family Planning Perspectives, 23*(5), September/October, 1991.

Edin, K. *Single Mothers and Absent Fathers: The Possibilities and Limits of Child Support Policy*. Piscataway, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1994.

Edwards, S.R. The role of men in contraceptive decision-making: Current knowledge and future implications. *Family Planning Perspectives, 26*(2), March/April, 1994.

Engle, P.L., & Leonard, A. Fathers as parenting partners. In J. Bruce, C.B. Lloyd, & A. Leonard (eds.), *Families in Focus: New Perspectives on Mothers, Fathers, and Children.* New York: The Population Council, 1995.

Fagan, J. *Evaluation of the Philadelphia Child Center's Men's Involvement Project: Third Year Report.* Philadelphia, no date.

Fagan, J. *Principles for developing male involvement programs in early childhood settings*. Submitted for publication, 1995.

Fagan, J., & Stevenson, H. Men as teachers: A self-help program on parenting for African American men. *Social Work with Groups, 17*(4), 29-42, 1995.

Family Impact Seminar/Institute for Research on Poverty. *Welfare Reform in the 104th Congress: Goals, Options and Tradeoffs.* A series of forums for Congressional staff. Washington, DC: Author, 1995.

Furstenberg, F.F., & Cherlin, A. J. *Divided Families: What Happens to Children When Parents Part.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Garfinkel, I., Miller, C., McLanahan, S., & Hanson, T. *Deadbeat dads or inept states? A comparison of child support enforcement systems*. Unpublished paper. May 1955.

Garrison, J., Smith, M., & Besharov, D. *Sex Education in the Schools.* (A Monograph from Sexuality and American Social Policy: A Seminar Series). Menlo Park, CA: Kaiser Family Foundation, 1994.

Hara, S., & Ooms, T. *Children's Mental Health Services: Policy Implications of the New Paradigm.* Washington, DC: Family Impact Seminar, 1994.

Hendershot, G.E., & LeClere, F.B. (Eds.). *Family Health: From Data to Policy.* Proceedings from a conference on family data and family health policy sponsored by the National Center for Health Statistics, Public Health Service, DHHS. Minneapolis, MN: National Council on Family Relations, 1993.

Henderson, A.T., Marburger, C.L., & Ooms, T. *Beyond the Bake Sale: An Educator's Guide to Working with Parents.* Columbia, MD: The National Committee for Citizens in Education, 1986.

Henshaw, S.K., & Torres, A. Family planning agencies: Services, policies and funding. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 26(2), March/April, 1994.

Horn, W.F. *Father Facts.* Lancaster, PA: National Fatherhood Initiative, 1995.

Jencks, C., & Edin, K. Do poor women have the right to bear children? *The American Prospect*, 20, Winter, 1995.

Kagan, S.L., Powell, D.R., Weissbourd, B., & Zigler, E.F. *America's Family Support Programs: Perspectives and Prospects.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Pres, 1987.

Kaiser Family Foundation. *Survey on Public Knowledge and Attitudes on Contraception and Unplanned Pregnancy.* Menlo Park, CA: Author, 1995.

Kirby, D. Sexuality and HIV education programs in schools. In *Sex Education in the Schools.* Menlo Park, CA: Kaiser Family Foundation, 1994.

Lamb, M. (Ed.). *Role of Fathers in Child Development.* 3rd Edition. New York: John Wiley, in press.

Lamb, M. *Parental Influences on Child Development.* Presentation at the Changing Fatherhood conference, Tilburg, The Netherlands, May, 1994.

Lamb, M., & Sagi, A. (Eds.). *Fatherhood and Family Policy.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1983.

Landry, D. & Camelo, D. Young unmarried men and women discuss men's role in contraceptive practice. *Family Planning Perspectives*, 26(5), October, 1994.

Lerman, R.I., & Ooms, T. (Eds.). *Young Unwed Fathers: Changing Roles and Emerging Policies.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1993.

Levine, J.A. Daddy stress-busters. *Child*, June/July 1995.

Levine, J.A. Daddy stress. *Child*, 87-90, June/July 1994.

Levine, J.A., & Hernandez, C.A. 30 great companies for dads. *Child*, 96-97, 126, 129-131, June/July, 1992.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Levine, J.A., Murphy, D.T, & Wilson, S. *Getting Men Involved: Strategies for Early Childhood Programs.* New York: Scholastic, Inc., 1993.

Levine, J.A., & Pitt, E.W. *New Expectations: National Goals and Community Strategies for Responsible Fatherhood.* New York: Families and Work Institute, 1995.

Lewin, T. Creating fathers out of men with children. *The New York Times,* A1, June 18, 1995.

Lloyd, C.B., & Duffy, N. Familial risk factors for children. In J. Bruce, C.B. Lloyd, & A. Leonard (eds.), *Families in Focus: New Perspectives on Mothers, Fathers, and Children.* New York: The Population Council, 1995.

Lubin, J.S. Yea to that 90s dad, devoted to the kids...but he's out again? *Wall Street Journal,* A1, A9, June 13, 1995.

Majors, R.G., & Gordon, J.U. (Eds.). *The American Black Male: His Present Status and His Future.* Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers, 1994.

Males, M. Teen mothers, adult fathers. *PSAY Network, 3*(2), 1, 11, June 1995.

Marsiglio, W. (Ed.). *Fatherhood: Contemporary Theory, Research and Social Policy.* California: Sage Publications, 1995.

Marsiglio, W. Adolescent males' orientation toward paternity and contraception. *Family Planning Perspectives, 25*(1), January/February, 1993.

McCoy-Thompson, M., Vanneman, J., & Bloom, F. *The Healthy Start Initiative: A Community-Driven Approach to Infant Mortality Reduction—Vol. II. Early Implementation: Lessons Learned.* Arlington, VA: National Center for Education in Maternal and Child Health, 1994.

McLanahan, S., & Sanderfur, G. *Growing Up with a Single Parent: What Hurts,What Helps.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Meyer, D. Can fathers support children born outside of marriage? Data on fathers' income over time. In Institute for Research on Poverty (ed.), *Paternity Establishment: A Public Policy Conference, Volume I: Studies of the Circumstance of Mothers and Fathers.* Madison, WI: Author, 1992.

Mincy, R. *Nurturing Young Black Males.* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute Press, 1994a.

Mincy, R. *Strengthening Fragile Families* (an internal strategy memorandum for the Ford Foundation). New York, NY: Ford Foundation, 1994b.

Mincy, R.B., & Sorensen, E. *Deadbeats and turnips in child support reform.* Paper presented at the Sixteenth Annual Research Conference of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, October 1994.

Moore, K.A., Miller, B.C., Sugland, B.W., Morrison, D.R., Glei, D.A., & Blumenthal, C. *Beginning Too Soon: Adolescent Sexual Behavior, Pregnancy and Parenthood.*

Executive summary and two related research review reports. Washington, DC: Child Trends, Inc., June 1995.

Musick, J. Poverty and teen pregnancy: implications for programs. *Family Life Matters*, 25, Spring, 1995.

National Center for Education in Maternal and Child Health. *Fathers: Selections from the 1995 SPRANS Database*. Arlington, VA: Author, May, 1995.

National Center for Fathering. *Fathers Matter: The Facts*. Shawnee Mission, KS: Author, 1995.

National Center on Fathers and Families. *Father Presence Matters Database: Abstracts, Annotations, and Citations*. Philadelphia: Author, August 1995.

National Center on Fathers and Families. *Fathers Care Database: Abstracts, Annotations, and Citations*. Philadelphia: Author, August 1995.

National Center on Fathers and Families. *Co-Parenting Database: Abstracts, Annotations, and Citations*. Philadelphia: Author, August 1995.

National Commission on Children. *Beyond Rhetoric: A New American Agenda for Children and Families*. Final Report. Washington, DC: Author, 1991.

O'Connell, M. *Where's Papa? Fathers' Role in Child Care*. Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau, Inc, 1993.

Ooms, T. (Ed.). *Teenage Pregnancy in a Family Context*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981.

Ooms, T., & Binder, H. *Keeping Troubled Families Together: Promising Programs and Statewide Reform*. Washington, DC: Family Impact Seminar, 1992.

Ooms, T., & Hara, S. *The Family-School Partnership: A Critical Component of School Reform*. A Background Briefing Report. Washington, DC: Family Impact Seminar, 1992.

Ooms, T., & Owen, T. *Encouraging Unwed Fathers to Be Responsible: Paternity Establishment, Child Support, and JOBS Strategies*. A Background Briefing Report. Washington, DC: Family Impact Seminar, 1990.

Ooms, T., & Owen, T. *Promoting Adolescent Health and Well-Being Through School-Linked, Multi-Service, Family-Friendly Programs*. A Background Briefing Report. Washington, DC: Family Impact Seminar, 1991.

Ooms, T., & Weinreb, J. *Reducing Family Poverty: Tax-Based and Child Support Strategies*. A Background Briefing Report. Washington, DC: Family Impact Seminar, 1992.

Pate, D. *Statement on Behalf of the Paternal Involvement Demonstration Project*. Testimony submitted to the U.S. House of Representatives Ways and Means Subcommittee on Human Resources, February 2, 1995.

Pirog-Good, M. In-kind contributions as child support: The teen alternative parenting program. In R. Lerman & T. Ooms, (eds.), *Young Unwed Fathers: Changing Roles and Emerging Policies*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Pleck, J.H., Sonenstein, F.L., & Ku, L. Changes in adolescent males' use of and attitudes toward condoms. *Family Planning Perspectives, 25*, 1993.

Pleck, J.H., Sonenstein, F.L., & Ku, L. Masculinity ideology: Its impact on adolescent heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Social Issues, 49*(3), 1993.

Pleck, J.H., Sonenstein, F.L., & Ku, L. Contraceptive attitudes and intention to use condoms in sexually experienced and inexperienced males. *Journal of Family Issues, 11*, 1990.

Powell, D.R. Involving Latino fathers in parent education and support programs. In R. Zambrano, (Ed.), *Understanding Latino Families: Scholarship, Policy and Practice*. California: Sage Publications, 1995.

Sable, M.R., et al. *Barriers to prenatal care: The Missouri experience*. Unpublished paper. n.d.

Sable, M.R., Stockbauer, J.W., Schramm, W.F., & Land, G.H. Differentiating the barriers to adequate prenatal care in Missouri, 1987-1988. *Public Health Reports, 105*(6), 549-555, November-December 1990.

Scales, P. Sex education and the prevention of teenage pregnancy: An overview of policies and programs in the United States. In T. Ooms, (Ed.), *Teenage Pregnancy in a Family Context*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1981.

Schimmel, D., & Fischer, L. (1977). *The Rights of Parents in the Education of Their Children*. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education, 1977.

Sex Information Education Council of the U.S. (SIECUS). *Guidelines for Comprehensive Sexuality Education*. New York: Author, 1990.

Sipe, C., & Batten, S. *School-Based Programs for Adolescent Parents and Their Young Children*. Bala Cynwyd, PA: Center for Assessment and Policy Development, 1994.

Skaff, J. *Dads' Club '95*. Presentation at the CLMS Conference, San Diego, CA, March 11, 1995.

Smollar, J., & Ooms, T. *Young Unwed Fathers: Research Review, Policy Dilemmas and Options*. Summary Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1987.

Snyder, W., & Ooms, T. (Eds.). *Empowering Families, Helping Adolescents: Family-Centered Treatment of Adolescents with Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Problems*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. DHHS Publication No. (ADM) 92-1745, 1991.

Sonenstein, F., & Pleck, J. *The male role in family planning: What do we know?* Paper prepared for the Committee on Unintended Pregnancy. Washington, DC: Institute of Medicine, 1994.

Sonenstein, F., Pleck, J. & Ku, L. Why men don't use condoms: Factors related to the consistency of utilization. In *Why Men Don't Use Condoms: What We Know About Male Attitudes*. (Sexuality and American Social Policy Series). Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1995.

Sorensen, E. *Noncustodial Fathers: Can They Afford to Pay More Child Support?* A report. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, February 1995.

Staton, J., Ooms, T., & Owen, T. *Family Resource, Support, and Parent Education Programs: The Power of a Preventive Approach.* A Background Briefing Report. Washington, DC: Family Impact Seminar, 1991.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Survey of Income and Program Participation.* Washington, DC: Author, 1991.

U.S. Commission on Interstate Child Support. *Supporting Our Children: A Blueprint for Reform.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993.

U.S. Department of Education. *Strong Families, Strong Schools: Building Community Partnerships for Learning.* Washington, DC: Author, September, 1994. Available from the National Family Involvement Partnership for Learning, 600 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20202.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement. *Child Support Report, 17*(6), June 1995.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement. *Child Support Enforcement: Eighteenth Annual Report to Congress.* For the period ending September 30, 1993. Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, OCSE, 1994.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement. *In-Hospital Paternity Establishment: A Resource Guide.* Washington, DC: Administration for Children and Families, OCSE, March 1994.

Wattenberg, E. Paternity actions and young fathers. In R. Lerman, & T. Ooms, (eds.), *Young Unwed Fathers: Changing Roles and Emerging Policies.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1993.

Williams, R.G., Venohr, J.C., Baxter, D.E., & Fitzgerald, L.M. *Massachusetts Paternity Acknowledgement Program: Implementation Analysis and Program Results.* Denver, CO: Policy Studies, Inc., May 1995.

Women's Legal Defense Fund. *What the Family and Medical Leave Act Means to You* (fact sheet). Washington, DC: Author, 1994.

Zambrano, R. (Ed.). *Understanding Latino Families: Scholarship, Policy and Practice.* California: Sage Publications, 1995.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART VII: HIGHLIGHTS OF THE SEMINAR

Held Friday, June 23, 1995, in 106 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Introduction

Theodora Ooms, Executive Director of the Family Impact Seminar, welcomed the panelists and seminar attendees. She noted that Ron Mincy of the Ford Foundation, which is funding this two-seminar series, pushed to have this first seminar happen the week of Father's Day.

This seminar is the first of two seminars that FIS is conducting on fatherhood issues, according to Ooms. The second seminar in the fatherhood series, planned for this Fall, will look at the state of data and research on fathers and will examine some of the really difficult ethical and legal situations around fathers' rights.

In 1977, when the Family Impact Seminar first became interested in the role of fathers in teen pregnancy, there was no research, very little data, no programs, and, therefore, very little to write about, said Ooms. "It is really gratifying that the panelists here today, many of whom were beginning to do their work right around that time, now have a lot to share with us and that their work is getting some recognition."

Fatherlessness has been called by David Blankenhorn America's most urgent social problem, and "The Kids Count Data Book," published by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, contains the data that shows the extent of the crisis. But the issue of fathers in policymaking is a huge topic to cover in just two seminars, contended Ooms.

Panelists at the seminar focused on community-based programs providing services specifically for low-income fathers who are a vastly underserved group. Secondly, the panelists discussed initiatives for reaching out to fathers in programs that are traditionally designed for mothers and children, such as Head Start.

The goal for this seminar, according to Ooms, is to provide attendees with ideas about how to include fathers that they can translate directly into their own work, whether in a government agency, a think tank, or in another organization.

Ooms read from a June 16, 1995, executive order from President Clinton to the heads of all Executive departments and agencies in which he directs them "to review every program, policy, and initiative that pertains to families to ensure ... that they seek to engage and meaningfully include fathers [and to] modify ... programs to explicitly include fathers and strengthen their involvement with their children."

Charles Ballard

The first presenter was Charles Ballard, President of the Institute for Responsible Fatherhood and Family Revitalization, which he began in Cleveland in 1978 to work with teen fathers. Since then, his program has grown, and will be replicated in several additional sites across the country as the result of a Ford Foundation grant.

"When we say 'family' in America, especially for African Americans, we really mean mothers and children," Ballard began. He said he found the President's proclamation

heartening because it signals that he has decided that fathers are important for the healthy raising of children.

Ballard believes that the most important problem in America faces is not the loss of jobs or housing or health care or welfare, but the issue of fatherlessness — including dysfunctional single fatherhood, dysfunctional divorced fatherhood, and dysfunctional married fatherhood. Crime and drug use and teenage pregnancy are really symptoms of this greater problem.

Ballard described research he conducted in the mid-1970s on 400 fathers, ranging in age from 14 to 55, in which he found that fathers were kept out of the lives of their children by the welfare system, the justice system, and the mothers themselves. In his work in a Cleveland hospital, he discovered that when a man loves his child's mother, supports her, and takes care of her, their baby has a higher birthweight.

Ballard mentioned his own experience as a young, unwed father who had served time in prison and had substance abuse problems, but who then turned his life around and helped raise his son. "There is something about when a man's heart is attached to his child, he becomes a different person mentally, physically, emotionally, and spiritually. And so, I have taken my own life, from my failure to success, and I have made that the model for this program," he said. Many men who now work as staff in Ballard's program started as program participants.

While women have a tremendous role to play in the lives of their children, "only the father can be the father and only the mother can be the mother" Ballard contended. "It takes the biologic father, who is irreplaceable, to bring a boy from maleness into responsible fatherhood."

He described the cycle of fatherlessness in which boys without fathers grow up to become young unwed fathers themselves; they transmit the behavior of their own absent fathers to their disconnected children. The biological father cannot be replaced with a mentor — even if the father is in prison or on drugs. "The children are saying, 'Give us our fathers. Not the doctors and the lawyers, but give us our fathers,'" he asserted.

Ballard's program hires people directly from the community who don't use drugs, alcohol, or cigarettes and who aren't abusive in their behavior. They become role models within the community; they demonstrate a risk-free lifestyle in the stores, at church, and at the barbershop, according to Ballard.

Because mothers must sign the orders for fathers to establish paternity, they must be convinced that the father's role is crucial to the raising of their children. Sometimes this requires intervention by a service provider. Ballard told a story about a woman in Dayton, Ohio, whose anger toward her child's father arose from the fact that she had been abused by all the men in her life. By treating her with respect, Ballard was able to help her understand that men could be compassionate and loving.

Ballard challenged service providers to dig a little deeper into mothers' reluctance to involve fathers. He suggested that it helps to assume that fathers should be involved.

"Government is in the business of managed fatherhood abandonment," according to Ballard. By providing food stamps, free medical care, housing allowances, and cash payments to mothers — all on the condition that fathers be kept out — government replicates slave owners treatment of black families, he contended.

"When we glorify single parenthood, we do a disservice to our community," Ballard continued. The Institute for Responsible Fatherhood has sought over the past 15 years to show that when fathers are included, safe environments for children, for women, and for fathers are created.

"No matter how strong the budget, no matter how many welfare stamps we give, we can never resolve the emotional hurt and pain that America is experiencing because of fatherlessness," he concluded.

Jim Levine

The next two speakers, Jim Levine and Ed Pitt, were from the Families and Work Institute in New York, where Jim Levine directs the Fatherhood Project, and Ed Pitt directs the Male Involvement Project.

Jim Levine described the origins of the Fatherhood Project. Set up in 1981 at the Bank Street College of Education, it is a practice-based, solution-oriented project examining the future of fatherhood and ways to support the involvement of men in child rearing. They examine community-based efforts around the country to find the ones that have demonstrated success. This fall they will publish "New Expectations: Community Strategies for Responsible Fatherhood," which offers a national framework for how to think about this whole area and looks at a number of programs, including the Institute for Responsible Fatherhood, the Paternal Involvement Demonstration Project, and military-based programs that may be of particular interest to the Federal Government. The Fatherhood Project also works with corporations to help change workplaces to be more responsive to fathers.

Levine focused his comments on the Project's work in the early childhood community, including Head Start, day care, and other family support programs.

Their research has shown that service providers have what amounts to a "don't-ask/don't-tell" policy when it comes to fatherhood — they don't ask and the mothers don't tell. Therefore, fathers are kept invisible through their collusion. Everybody knows that there is a father in the household — whether he is the biological father or not. "All you have to do is look in the housekeeping area of any of these programs and see kids playing out the roles of mothers and fathers to know that these kids are aware of fathers in their lives," he noted.

Similarly, the research community has developed a "don't-look/don't-see" policy, he asserted. Task force after task force recommends that we should look at the role of fathers. In 1991, the Male Involvement Demonstration Project, funded by HHS, gave seed money to six programs to do outreach to include fathers. But yet, in 1992, when HHS set about to fund the largest study ever done of parental involvement in Head Start, it surveyed 1,000 parents — and not one of them was a father.

Levine's practice-based research shows us that fathers *are* there. In Head Start programs that officially record 80 percent of families headed by single-mothers, Levine found that half of those families have a man in the household.

Programs that have been successful in reaching fathers have developed innovative approaches, according to Levine. As an example, he highlighted Parents Involved in Community Action in Minnesota, which serves 2,000 parents. Eight years ago that realized they had no men in the program, due primarily to an attitudinal problem on the part of their mostly female staff. They realized the already had a resource for reaching out to

men in the community: 54 male bus drivers. By adding two hours a day to their six-hour schedules, they made the bus drivers, who all came from the local community, into community liaisons to work with mothers and fathers and start to bring them into the program. Rather than creating a "fatherhood add-on," they have completely transformed the way that they think about the role of men in children's lives in that program. Now, as much as 40% of the attendees at parents' meetings are fathers.

On the research side, Levine suggested that the government require the inclusion of fathers in all federally funded research on child and family life unless it can be shown why this will compromise the effectiveness of the research.

Ed Pitt

Ed Pitt of the Male Involvement Project said that all policies and programs must be examined to see to what extent they facilitate or hinder the participation of fathers in the lives of children.

Pitt trains Head Start and day care providers about how to increase the participation of fathers and men in the lives of young children. He has found that staff are often ambivalent about including fathers who are not married to the mother and may not be paying child support.

On the other hand, these very same programs are what Pitt called "opportunity systems" because they are very close to the community and are considered family-friendly. Head Start, in particular, hires and trains community people — many of them current or former Head Start parents themselves — to staff their programs, he said. In fact, over half of the people who work in Head Start are former Head Start parents or children.

Pitt helps service providers understand how not to jeopardize the mothers' eligibility, while at the same time bringing children the support of their fathers.

Pitt noted that training front-line staff is not enough. National leaders must stress the importance of men being actively involved in their children's lives — not just talk about their financial responsibilities. Unfortunately, according to Pitt, the national mood is, "if they are not paying, then they are not playing." Pitt asserted that, even though child support enforcement must remain a priority, we can't let men's failure to provide financial support block their involvement in their children's lives.

Pitt also contested the prevalent attitude that fathers are neither available to, nor interested in, their children. He noted the success of some of the The Healthy Start demonstration programs in involving father's in the prenatal care of their partners. The women attended prenatal care visits more often, and both parents cut down on their negative health behaviors. "Like women and mothers, men tend to behave based on the way they think they are expected to behave," he said. Pitt has found that men are more responsive when expectations are specific. His project and its publications provide specific suggestions on how to operationalize father involvement. (This is also true about program funding and evaluation, he added. If father involvement is expected and tied to funding and evaluation, it will occur.)

Pitt concluded that unless programs change their attitudes about fathers, "men are going to stay underground or minimally involved."

David Pate

The fourth speaker, David Pate, was, until quite recently, Director of the Paternal Involvement Demonstration Project in Chicago, a three-site program in Chicago. He is now the Senior Consultant to the new Center for Fathers, Families, and Public Policy at the Family Resource Coalition offices in Chicago and a doctoral student at the University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Pate described the non-custodial fathering project in Chicago for 18- to 35-year-old men whose children all received AFDC benefits. The program's main objective was to foster emotional and financial commitment in fathers. Additionally, it examined public policies that either hindered or supported fathers' commitment to their children. It was funded by a collaboration of 13 groups, including the state welfare and children's agencies and 11 private foundations. They looked at the child support system, the paternity establishment process, employment opportunities in the State; they reviewed other systems, like homeless shelters, treatment centers, prisons, to see how they involved men in the lives of their kids. Too often, Pate and his colleagues found systems that were not working on behalf of fathers.

Because most of the low-income men in Pate's project don't understand the legal system, including paternity establishment, child support orders, and visitation rights, education was very important, he noted. Service providers, too, needed education and sensitivity training about the role of the father. Pate described the attitudinal barriers he confronted as an African-American male when he tested the system by pretending to establish paternity on a voluntary basis for a non-existent child.

Pate's program also paid particular attention to the role mothers played in the project. This was especially true if there was a breakdown in the relationship between the mother and father, which is one of the biggest problems he saw in his project. The program always contacted the custodial mother before engaging the non-custodial father, so as to ensure that they weren't fueling an adversarial relationship.

In June of 1993, with the help of the Legal Assistance Foundation of Chicago, Pate and his colleagues determined that the State of Illinois was providing far better services for couples with kids who were divorcing — including mediation services, psychological counseling, social services, and child care — than they were offering to unmarried couples and non-custodial parents. Believing this was in violation of the equal treatment protections of the 14th Amendment, Pate's group educated legislators and others on the unfair treatment of low-income, non-custodial parents.

Pate's program also examined the state's IV-D system. He found that some men in his project had established paternity, were paying child support, and had visitation rights but still had no access to their children. The system had established an economic Catch-22 situation in which men who were dutifully paying their child support were actually decreasing the total money that the custodial mothers were receiving. When formal child support is paid to an AFDC recipient, all but $50 per month goes directly directly to the state to help pay for the AFDC benefit. Therefore, if a father pays $200 per month in support, $150 goes to the state and only $50 to the mother. However, previously the mother may have been receiving the $200 under the table from the man. She may feel cheated by this situation and deny visitation access to the father, according to Pate. The state does not help the father in such a situation; it can't offer confidential information about the whereabouts of the mother. The Public Aid office is only interested in securing child support payments and will not deal with any emotional issues. The only service offered by the state's non-custodial support unit is job placement. A promising new initiative by the

state is the non-custodial parenting unit, which recognizes the complex life situations of never-married, low-income, non-custodial parents.

Another barrier non-custodial fathers in Illinois have to confront is that when paternity is established, the father's name is not automatically put on the birth certificate. Although legislation has been introduced each year, the state legislature has yet to change this law, which Pate said characterizes politicians understanding of these issues.

Illinois does allow men to live in AFDC households, but Pate noted that many welfare recipients haven't been educated about this provision. Pate has worked to offer welfare-to-work program to help men who want to stay in the house and help support the kids and their mother, but the state has not been supportive, which leads Pate to ask whether policymakers are committed to putting fathers in welfare households.

Pate cited the federal waiver for Illinois' JOBS programs as a potential benefit for non-custodial fathers, as it would make it possible for them to participate in the JOBS training and employment program. But he also questioned whether there were jobs out there for some of the most unskilled and undereducated men he served. For many of them, the $4.50 an hour they can make serves their children better as under-the-table payments, not subject to AFDC repayment. Pate added that the system must recognize the prevalence of discrimination against minorities in hiring.

Many men in Illinois are under the mistaken impression that visitation rights come directly with paternity establishment, according to Pate. Visitation is handled separately, and often requires legal representation. Pate's program offers pro bono legal services to fathers, but he believes that the system must become more father-friendly. He noted that Vermont Family Courts may be the only ones in the nation that determine both paternity establishment and visitation at the same time.

Finally, Pate suggested that we stop describing fathers solely as protectors. We should expand our definition of fathers beyond breadwinners and protectors to include their important nurturing role.

Gordon Berlin

The last speaker was Gordon Berlin, Senior Vice President of the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation in New York.

While child support enforcement strategies alone are not going to work, neither will support programs for fathers, began Berlin. "The challenge really is to try to marry both of these areas."

The fathers that Berlin engaged in the National Parents' Fair Share demonstration project, managed by the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, so see their children frequently, but the hard truth for policymakers is that many just don't have jobs. The dramatic secular decline in real wages for poorly educated men underway for nearly two decades creates real problems for their ability to pay child support. But, at the same time, the child support enforcement system is necessary because many fathers do have income and earnings and still don't do the right thing, even with a lot of support, he contended.

Berlin described Parents' Fair Share, a multi-site demonstration program authorized by the Family Support Act to help selected states provide services to non-custodial parents who aren't paying child support because they are unemployed. Similar to the JOBS welfare-to-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

work program for custodial parents, Parents' Fair Share allows fathers to fulfill their child support obligation by participating in employment and training services, peer support for father involvement, and dispute resolution services.

Parents' Fair Share does offer "enhanced child-support enforcement," which means responding to the actual ability of fathers to pay. Child support orders are lowered while the men are actively participating in the program. And, the program offers dispute resolution and mediation services because, according to Berlin, when a father pays more and sees his children more, conflict with the mother is more likely.

The program includes a random assignment evaluation design comparing the outcomes of men assigned to the program with outcomes for a control group of similar non-custodial fathers. The evaluation will answer several questions: Do the fathers in the program pay more support? Do their earnings increase, enabling them to pay more support? Are they more involved with their children?

Using Elaine Sorensen's (of the Urban Institute) analysis of SIPP data, Berlin described the typical non-custodial parent. A significant share of non-custodial fathers, especially fathers of children on AFDC, are themselves poor. Their average age is 37. They have less than a high school education and are often unemployed or under-employed. They work intermittently, but not regularly. A surprising 38 percent of them reside with a second family. Half have paid no child support; 30 percent contributed less than 15 percent of their total income. Because Parents' Fair Share targets the parents of AFDC children who are not paying child support ostensibly since they are unemployed, the fathers engaged in the program are substantially more disadvantaged than the average non-custodial father.

"Child support enforcement is a blunt instrument," asserted Berlin. If the fathers don't want to cooperate, there isn't much that the child-support enforcement system can do besides putting him in jail -- which is prohibitively expensive. And, the system really doesn't have a response when fathers say they are unemployed, he noted.

A too-tough enforcement strategy may end up driving poor, often minority, men further underground, according to Berlin. And this is compounded by the staggering debt these men face: the average child-support arrearage was more than $4,000 for fathers referred to the Parents' Fair Share program. However, contrary to popular stereotype, a large percentage of these men reported seeing their kids quite frequently.

"The challenge for child-support enforcement is not getting somebody to pay child support today," said Berlin. "It is getting them to pay child support month after month after month after month." He saluted fatherhood initiatives like those described by the other panelists as important to creating a sense of connection for fathers who otherwise might evade the child support system.

Berlin also cited the perverse AFDC financial disincentives to responsible fatherhood and noted that poor, minority fathers don't view the child support system and the courts as friendly to their interests.

Not only does Parents' Fair Share provide the courts with an alternative place to send non-paying unemployed fathers, but it also helps ferret out those fathers who are trying to hide their income. "We have uncovered about 15 to 20 percent of the men who, on Day Two, announce that they miraculously have a job," said Berlin.

One of the most important accomplishments of Parents' Fair Share is that it has forced the child support system to revamp the way it does business. Berlin characterized the system as more responsive, particularly in lowering support orders when men enter the program, and getting automatic wage withholding in place once they become employed.

Berlin concluded by offering few key questions:

1. Are we driving more poor and minority men further underground if we pursue an enforcement-only strategy?

2. How far can we go with fatherhood initiatives and supports? How much more child support, for example, could we expect to collect if we emphasize fatherhood programs alone?

3. How many of these nonprofit community agencies offering fathers support are going to be willing to make the connection to the child-support enforcement obligation? Are they confident enough in their ability to get fathers jobs that they are willing to help fathers establish paternity — and thereby incur the obligation to pay support for the next 20 years? Will they be able to maintain the fathers' trust when they realize that jail is a possibility for fathers who don't comply with child support orders?

Discussion

One questioner asked how the panelists would, under the expected devolution and block grants, restructure the AFDC program to get rid of the perverse economic incentives against father involvement?

Berlin agreed that a new system should reward work and father involvement but questioned how much it would cost. Pate said that a reformed system must recognize that fathers are parents in the same way that mothers are — more that just "a paycheck."

Pitt added that the system has to be designed to support the participation of fathers. He identified Head Start as a program that could really reach out to fathers. "I believe that part of the reason that these systems don't do more outreach to men is because they understand that if they bring them into the system, they are going to have to service them," he added.

Ron Mincy of the Ford Foundation said that a good system would "marry" Berlin's Parents' Fair Share with Ballard's Institute. "I would sit a non-adversarial, community-based program between paternity establishment and child support to do two things" he said — to encourage the couple to establish paternity for the child and to help the couple manage the financial risk associated with doing that. He noted that it's much easier to arrange a positive child-support order on the front end than it is to fix one that doesn't work on the back end. The overwhelming child support arrearages Berlin described could be overcome by negotiating a flexible child support order up front that would allow a father's contribution to increase as his income rises.

A second questioner noted the success of divorce mediation in settling visitation disputes and asked how hospital paternity establishment systems could be changed to help establish fathers' access to their children.

Pate explained that it's important in hospital paternity establishment that both parents be notified of when they need to appear in court to actually establish the paternity. He also

encouraged more comprehensive education programs for new parents about the benefits of paternity establishment for the mother and child, as well as for the father.

Ballard described a typical scenario of a woman coming in for a pregnancy test in Cleveland. The hospital staffer should ask: "In what way do you see the father being involved in the pregnancy?" By expecting the father's involvement rather than asking if she wants him involved, the staffer normalizes his participation. The female staffer then recommends a fathering community program where the father-to-be can talk to other men who will "help him to understand what [the woman is] experiencing as a pregnant person." Once she agrees, Ballard's program approaches the father and begins by helping him heal the pain of growing up without his own father. With the help of the two workers, the couple begins to develop a good relationship that did not even exist before the pregnancy. Six to nine months later, they may marry or the father may establish paternity, but they definitely will have a healthier baby, asserted Ballard. "And you have a father that probably already has a job, because he has not waited for you to give him a job. He knows that it is his responsibility to do for his child what his father never did for him."

Ooms added that OBRA 1993 required all states to find ways to establish paternity on a voluntary basis in the hospital or community, and that some are now thinking about placing such efforts at an earlier stage, in the prenatal care clinics.

A seminar attendee asked for information about the National Practitioners' Network. Pitt explained that NPN, which was launched at Vice President Gore's Family ReUnion last year, is a network of community-based nonprofits and state and local agencies that work with fathers. Housed at the Families and Work Institute, the NPN should be able to help promote the intermediary agencies that Ballard described in his scenario.

Another attendee expressed frustration at going to meetings where solutions and research are discussed when the actual action of implementation happens at a "snail's pace."

Vivian Gadsden described the National Center for Fathers and Families at the University of Pennsylvania (which she heads) as a practice-focused, practice-derived center conducting research on fathers and families, including work on the systemic barriers to father involvement and the role of unemployment on fatherlessness. She asked how programs like Head Start and Healthy Start can substantively involve fathers without creating adversarial relationships with the mothers, who may be loathe to give up the support they receive and the power they have.

Levine mentioned his recent book, "Getting Men Involved," that looks at 14 successful programs in the Head Start and early childhood area as a resource. His new book, "New Expectations: Community Strategies for Responsible Fatherhood," profiles programs beyond the early childhood community and draws policy and practice lessons from them. Levine has found that the most successful programs —like Ballard's — actively enlist the support of mothers, as well as the encouragement of the mostly female staff in these agencies. When offering training to female staff, one has to be aware that many of these women come from their own history of being abandoned by their fathers, being abandoned by husbands, and being abused by men at one point or another, according to Levine.

Ballard responded that he found that the fathers in his program have serious problems with three institutions: the welfare system, the justice system, and the educational system. In each system, the young men are made to feel like failures. Ballard believes that the young fathers must be empowered to deal with these systems so they can teach their sons or daughters to see the educational system as being friendly. Although the government may

be well-meaning, they are doing harm to families, according to Ballard. "The first message I would say to the government is: 'Do no harm to the family.'"

A researcher offered several lessons from programs that tried to involve fathers, such as the Adolescent Family Life (AFL) Program. Program guidelines must explicitly mandate father involvement from the beginning, not suggest it as an add-on later as the AFL program did. Even the model Healthy Start program in Baltimore has involved only 50 men for the 600 births a year they serve, she noted. She added that she's never evaluated a successful male involvement program that didn't use male workers "who understand how to talk to kids on the street and how to talk to men who don't have jobs."

Ron Mincy concluded the session by noting that the panelists represent three generations of work at the Ford Foundation on fatherhood: in the late 1970s, Levine ran an eight-site fatherhood project; in the mid-1980s, the Foundation supported Parents' Fair Share and the Young Unwed Fathers Project; and all of the panelists are part of a current Ford initiative, Strengthening Fragile Families, which seeks to help young, unwed couples who are low-skilled.

Mincy said that it's critical to develop a dialogue with women and with women's groups about the importance of fathers in families, particularly since social service agencies are staffed primarily by women. This conversation is an important part of the evolution of public policy regarding fathers, according to Mincy. Neglecting to engage women — particularly low-income women — will cut the fatherhood initiatives "off at the knees," he added.

The second seminar in this series will offer an opportunity for this dialogue to begin, noted Ooms.

DISCONNECTED DADS: STRATEGIES TO PROMOTE RESPONSIBLE FATHERHOOD

FATHERS' RESPONSIBILITIES	PREVENT OUT-OF-WEDLOCK BIRTHS	PROVIDE ECONOMIC SUPPORT	BUILD FATHER-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS
POLICIES AND PROGRAM STRATEGIES	-*Sex and family-life education.* -*School-based sex education.* -*Community awareness.* -*School-based health centers.* -*Family planning agencies.*	-*Paternity establishment.* -*Child support enforcement.* -*Employment and training for non-custodial fathers.*	*Father involvement in:* -*Head Start and other early childhood education programs.* -*Family support programs and parent education programs.* -*Maternal and child health programs.* -*Programs for children with special health needs.* -*Schools.* -*Work-related policies.*
INNOVATIVE EXAMPLES	-*Governor's Teen Pregnancy Prevention Initiative: Promoting Male Responsibility, CA.* -*The Family Planning Council of South Eastern Pennsylvania.* -*National Urban League Male Responsibility Initiative.* -*New Orleans, Plain Talk Initiative.* - *Wise Guys Program, Family Life Council of Greater Greensboro, NC.*	-*Young Unwed Fathers - Pilot Project.* -*Parents' Fair Share Demonstration.* -*In-Hospital Paternity Establishment: Denver and Colorado, New York City, Washington State, and Virginia.* -*Paternal Involvement Demonstration Project, Chicago.*	-*Male Involvement Project Philadelphia Parent and Child Center.* -*MELD para Nueva Familia, Minneapolis.* -*YWCA/NY Young Fathers Program.* -*Baltimore Healthy Start Initiative.* -*National Father Network for Children With Special Care Needs.* -*Dad's Club at Ranch Middle School, Milpitas, CA.*
NATIONAL FATHERHOOD ORGANIZATIONS	*--Fatherhood Project (Families and Work Institute, New York) --Father Policy Institute (Family Resource Coalition, Chicago --Institute for Responsible Fatherhood and Family Revitalization (Washington, DC) -- National Center on Fathering, (Kansas) --National Center on Fathers and Families (Philadelphia) -- National Fatherhood Initiative (Lancaster, PA).*		